FROM THE LIBRARY OF

REV. LOUIS FITZGERALD BENSON, D. D.

BEQUEATHED BY HIM TO

THE LIBRARY OF

PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

SCC
9412

A

VINDICATION

OF THE

DISSENTERS:

In Answer to

Dr. *William Nichols's* DEFENCE

OF THE

Doctrine and Diſcipline

OF THE

CHURCH of *ENGLAND.*

In Three PARTS.

Written firſt in *Latin*, and now Tranſlated into *Engliſh*, with large Additions.

By *JAMES PEIRCE.*

The Second Edition, Corrected.

Ἂν ἓν ἀναιρεθῇ ἀφ' ὑμῶν τὰ σκάνδαλα καὶ τὰ πρόσκομματα, πολλῷ μᾶλλον ἀναιρεθήσεται τὸ κείνειν καὶ καλακείνειν. —— ταύτην κρηπίδα πρώτην καταβάλλεσθε. Ἂν αὕτη ἐδραιωθῇ ἐν ὑμῖν ἡ κρηπὶς, ῥᾴον τὰ ἄλλα ἐποικοδομεῖν ἔχεις. Oecum. in Rom. xiv.

LONDON:

Printed for JOHN CLARK *at the* Bible *and* Crown *in the* Poultry, *near* Cheapſide. 1718.

Second Edition 1719.

A

VINDICATION

OF THE

DISSENTERS:

In ANSWER to

[illegible] Nicholls's DEFENCE

OF THE

Doctrine and Discipline

OF THE

CHURCH of ENGLAND.

In Three PARTS.

Written first in [illegible], and now Translated into [illegible], with large Additions.

By JAMES PEIRCE.

The Second Edition, Corrected.

[illegible] Oecum. in Rom. xiv.

LONDON:

Printed for JOHN CLARK at the Table and Crown in the Poultry, near Cheapside. 1718.

TO THE

Most Reverend, Pious, and Learned PASTORS, *and* MINISTERS, *of that part of Christ's Church which is in* Scotland.

REVEREND BRETHREN,

MANY weighty reasons move me to dedicate this my *Defence*, such as it is, to you, and to make choice of you, as the Arbitrators to whom I would especially appeal. For what better Judges can I desire in this Controversy, than those who are fam'd both for Christian discipline, and true piety? Which noble virtues (I say it

without flattery) are no where more conſpicuous than in your aſſemblies. The ardent zeal for God's worſhip and pure religion, for which you have been renowned of old, has been ſo far from being extinguiſh'd; that it has been inflam'd and brighten'd by thoſe horrible and very long perſecutions, out of which above twenty years ago it pleas'd our moſt merciful God and Father to deliver you. Being mindful of this great benefit, you diligently diſcharge the important truſt committed to you. The good Lord grant you may always go on to do ſo with the like, and even greater care, diligence, and ſucceſs. What pious perſon can forbear reſpecting and reverencing Chriſt's vineyard happily planted among you; where it is not, as in many other parts, miſerably trampled under foot, but wonderfully defended by his mighty and gracious hand, and abounds in all the fruits of righteouſneſs; wherein impiety, which elſewhere rages without

out controul, is ſtrictly curb'd and reſtrain'd? Nor are there wanting among our Churchmen perſons of candor and reputation, who highly honour you upon this account. *

I HAVE the rather embrac'd this firſt opportunity that has offer'd, that I might teſtify the ſincere affection not of my own heart only, but of the *Diſſenters* in general towards you.

AND there is the more reaſon for this, becauſe we are lately more ſtrictly united to one another; and we, who before made two kingdoms, tho' the inhabitants of the ſame iſland, are now cemented into one people living under one and the ſame authority. Now nature it ſelf has taught mankind, that 'tis the duty of fellow ſubjects to promote

* *See Dr.* Edward's Sermons upon the Union.

love and a good correſpondence between one another. To whom therefore ſhould perſons rather leave the arbitration of their differences, than to their fellow ſubjects? or, who can be expected to underſtand, or more impartially to determine their quarrels? Had our Adverſaries been thus minded, there would have been no need for their giving our Brethren abroad the trouble of this *Appeal*.

BUT among the Reform'd Divines, to whom this *Appeal* is made by Dr. *Nichols*, a Presbyter and Defender of the Church of *England*, your name is never once mention'd. * Wherefore ſince I could not appeal to you in the body of the Book, having reſolv'd to acquieſce in the Judges he was pleas'd to chuſe; I thought it would be but decent, by this *Dedi-*

cation,

---

* *That he may ſeem to bring 'em in, he has chang'd* apud Anglos, *in the* Latin *Edition*, p. 116. *into* in Great Britain, *in the Tranſlation*, p. 143.

cation, to teſtify the value we have for your judgment, and to requeſt you to give it in our Controverſy. Nor can Dr. *Nichols* be diſpleas'd, that I have taken you to be Judges between us; ſince he himſelf choſe the Foreign Divines of his own head, and without asking our conſent in the matter. Nor do I ſay this as tho' I would decline the judgment of our Brethren abroad, nothing leſs; but only that I may conſult both your, and their reputation, which he has injur'd. For by appealing to our Brethren abroad only, he either deſpiſes you, as no good friends to the Reform'd Religion; or, at leaſt, does not own you as Brethren, and upright Judges: or, if he does, he muſt be underſtood to mean that he deſires no ſuch Judges in this cauſe. Herein he has follow'd the example of his Predeceſſors, who, with the like deſign of ſlurring your reputation, took care that no deputies ſhould be ſent from SCOTLAND to

the famous *Synod* of DORT. But what ground is there for theſe ill natur'd ſuſpicions? What are you, MY BRETHREN, or what have you done, that our Adverſaries ſhould be more afraid of your arbitration, than of the Foreign Divines? Are you Preſbyterians? So are our Brethren abroad alſo. Have you rejected the Popiſh ceremonies? They have rejected them in like manner. Why then are the Divines in SCOTLAND the only ones, to whoſe arbitration they appear ſo averſe?

'TIS paſt doubt with me, that the contempt, which the Doctor and his Aſſociates would caſt upon you, will fall upon themſelves. Nor is it any wonder, if they, who are ſenſible of the badneſs of their cauſe, ſhew themſelves deſirous of ſuch Judges, as are moſt remote from the matters, concerning which they are to give their judgment: for they know very well, it will be hard for them thoroughly

thoroughly to ſearch into them; and ſo they may be the more like to favour them in their determination. They are ſatisfy'd, you are ſo fully appriz'd of every thing relating to the Doctrine, Diſcipline and Worſhip of the Church the Doctor undertakes to defend, as that it will not be poſſible to impoſe upon you concerning them; and that you are men of ſuch integrity and reſolution, as leave no room to them to hope you will be ſway'd by any reſpect of perſons to judge in their favour. And what? are you the only Divines of the Preſbyterian perſuaſion, whom they think too firm to be wrought upon by their fawning, or perſuaded to give your vote for the condemning us, whoſe judgment in the controverted points is ſo agreeable to your own? I am ſure, when they pretend to think otherwiſe of the Foreign Divines, they treat them as perſons very fickle, and not conſiſtent with themſelves. But if they ſhould hereafter appear not to have been

been miſtaken; you may be aſſur'd of gaining as much reputation, as they will loſe. Nevertheleſs we doubt not in the leaſt, all theſe jealouſies, our Adverſaries would raiſe concerning our Brethren, are groundleſs and unjuſt: and we are perſuaded, they will never diſſent from you in their judgment of a cauſe, which ought to be decided with the utmoſt fairneſs and impartiality. But bear patiently, MY BRETHREN, the indignity offer'd you; and the leſs you ſee there is of reſpect, and civility in their treatment, the more chearfully accept our friendſhip.

HER Majeſty, who has accompliſh'd the long deſir'd union of the two kingdoms, has often and earneſtly exhorted all her united ſubjects to be united alſo in affections. But ſince this is not much reliſh'd by the Epiſcopal party, even thoſe of them who pretend to moderation, if we may form a conjecture from our Author; what remains, but that we, who

are

are knit to you in the ſame faith, worſhip, form of government, diſcipline, deſigns, and brotherly love, ſhould experience your mutual affection and aſſiſtance?

We have known this a long while, that you ſet light by mitres, magnificence, and civil honors in religious matters. Freely then and impartially, as becomes the Divines of Scotland, give your judgment in our Controverſy; and ſince you beſt underſtand the ſtate of it, begin, and ſet a good example to the reſt of our Brethren.

But if we ſeem any where to have been too liberal in our conceſſions to our Adverſaries, as without doubt we have err'd there, if any where; you will pleaſe to impute it partly to human frailty, and partly to our being carried away (as men ſometimes are) by a too vehement deſire of peace; and therefore will the more eaſily overlook it. Fur-

FURTHER, I can't but acquaint you, that whenever we attempt any thing displeasing to the friends of the Hierarchy, they presently by their perverse interpretations represent it as a crime against the King's Majesty; just as they serv'd your famous Mr. *Knox*, in his exile at *Frankfort*, when they carry'd their cause against him, by accusing him of high treason against the Emperor. Thus in the latter end of the last Century they most bitterly inveigh'd against us, as transgressors of the laws, and despisers of the King's power in spirituals, only because we were contriving how to set on foot a general correspondence among the Dissenters: altho' the *Quakers* have for many years practis'd the same, without any one's forbidding them. Hence you will easily perceive, the ill usage and cavils of our Adversaries have been the reason, why the order of our Churches has not been more agreeable to that which is in use with you, and in other Reform'd countries.

BUT

BUT the more melancholy and afflicted you obſerve the condition of the Church of Chriſt in this part of our dear country to be, the more earneſtly do you help it both by your counſels and prayers. For as the Chriſtian law obliges us to rejoice with you, who rejoice; ſo it obliges you too to weep with us, who weep. We likewiſe promiſe always to make it our requeſt, that our good God would make you, in all reſpects, proſperous and flouriſhing; your country in the abundance of all things; your Univerſities in renown for arts and ſciences; your Church in faith, piety, a pure worſhip, and vigorous diſcipline; that he would guide you all by his moſt Holy Spirit, and ſucceed all your labours; finally, that he would defend you in that happy condition, wherein he has plac'd you, giving a large increaſe to it, and making it to endure through all generations.

The DEDICATION.

ALL which bleſſings are more heartily wiſh'd you by none, than by,

REVEREND BRETHREN,

Your great admirer,

and moſt affectionate,

tho' unworthy, Brother,

James Peirce.

THE PREFACE.

THE *Dissenters took it ill, when* Dr. Nichols's *Book was first publish'd, that they were falsly represented and accused to their Brethren abroad. For my own part, when I reflected on the correspondence there had been a little before between* Oxford *and* Geneva, *I could not help suspecting, there was some design reviv'd of trying practices upon some Foreigners abroad; whom our Adversaries thought they might best influence in a certain method, that they might procure a testimony from them against us, and then publish it to the world. And I have since been confirm'd in my suspicion. However we were not so satisfied in the treatment we used to meet with at home, as not to be well pleas'd with an opportunity of laying our cause before more equal and impartial Judges abroad. Our behaviour for a long time has been witness, we are not fond of debating this Controversy, except when our own defence, and the importunate clamours of our Adversaries, have made it necessary.*

We have too easily hoped, the avoiding a formal debate might be a means to calm mens tempers, and dispose them to peace and union.

The way of managing this Controversy which the Doctor took, by writing in Latin, *was likely to contribute little to the souring peoples tempers at home, and might yet be of considerable advantage; provided our Brethren in Foreign Churches, upon an* Appeal *from both sides, would undertake to be* Mediators *between us. And I dare almost promise for the Dissenters, that they shall stand to their award. As to my self, were our Reformation carried as far, as I am confident they would think necessary, I should fall in with it in a Lay capacity, whether I could come up to the terms requir'd of a Minister or not. For to say the truth, the Church of* England *has so quite surfeited me with impositions, that I am utterly averse to them.*

When an Answer to the Doctor was thought necessary, the task of making it fell upon me, much against my inclination, who, as my friends know, endeavour'd all I could to decline it. However, when it came out, I had the happiness to give good satisfaction universally to my Brethren at home; and to such of the learned abroad as saw it, and even to some among them who were thought most likely to favour our Adversaries. Nay, I was assur'd of its gaining a much greater commendation among the Churchmen, than I expected. And I could name as considerable persons as any in the Church, who own'd 'twas a full Answer to the Doctor. I could not but think the Doctor himself had the same apprehensions, when I heard he had resolv'd to make no reply; which many beside my self concluded he would

would certainly have done, if he could, for the same reason for which he publish'd his Defence, *contrary to the advice of some of his friends.*

I thought my self safe therefore from any farther trouble, and was well pleas'd with the Foreign Divines having both our Appeals *before them. Several persuaded me to translate my* Vindication, *which I constantly refus'd; nay, when an offer was made me of easing me of the trouble, by another person's translating it, I would by no means consent, being desirous the Controversy should go no further.*

I therefore little expected a Translation would ever be publish'd of the Doctor's Book; and could not, when it came out, but have the curiosity of dipping a little here and there into it, and perusing the Preface. I was surprized to find a book recommended to the Dissenters, as proper to convince them; without the least notice taken, that an Answer had been made to it. I took it for granted, the Translator and Prefacer both (if they were not the same person) were satisfied the Answer was sufficient, because they said nothing to disparage it; which no body will suspect to be owing to their moderation, good temper, or modesty.

I soon return'd the Book, not thinking my self oblig'd to take notice of what all the world would probably despise, as being already confuted. Nor could the desire of several move me at that time to set about a Translation. But finding that the Doctor's piece was much recommended to English *readers, and that it was become the general opinion of my friends, that the putting my* Vindication *into* English *might be of service, I yielded to the drudgery I was not very fond of.*

I knew the work would be easier to me than any other person, and I might use that liberty which another could not. Besides, I was willing to make some additions to the Historical Part, that I might the more expose that most odious of all abominations, Persecution, which hangs like a milstone about the neck of our Adversaries cause. This I have largely done in the darkest time of the history of our sufferings, the reign of Queen Elizabeth. *And tho' this has so swell'd the First Part; yet I flatter my self, the entertainment it will give the reader, will be a sufficient apology for me; and if not, I can use no other.*

In the Second Part I have left out all that was said about those Doctrinal Controversies, wherein Nonconformity is not really concern'd.

The Last Part is generally a strict translation, little being added, or left out. It contains all the heads relating to Discipline and Worship, which being in a manner the whole of the Controversy, I think it will help a person to a full view of it. Some things here are indeed out of the way of common English *readers; but I have inserted them, because I would have my work a compleat Answer to whatever may be met with in the* English *books of our Adversaries.*

The remainder of this Preface *shall be spent upon that which is prefix'd to the Translation of the Doctor's* Defence; *not because I apprehend it contains any thing material in it, but only to prevent any very weak readers being imposed on by it. 'Tis indeed such a solemn piece of impertinence, that one may safely conclude, it was writ by much such another Divine of the Church of* England, *as the Translator;*

lator ; unleſs he were, as is moſt probable, the very ſame.

After he has given his judgment of the Book, which the reader will not much regard, who intends to judge for himſelf upon the peruſal, he with a very grave and magiſterial air, according to the faſhion of the party, beſeeches *the Diſſenters* to conſider the arguments on both ſides, with that ſeriouſneſs and impartiality, which the importance of the cauſe requires. *And yet one may almoſt vouch for him, his own conſideration riſes little higher than Dr.* Nichols's *piece, and he has taken what he ſays upon truſt too ; as one may ſee by his copying after the falſe quotations of his Author, which he would certainly have corrected, if he had examin'd the writings refer'd to. But can any thing be more ridiculous, than to deſire the* Diſſenters *to conſider (whereby he implies, they have not conſider'd, and can't anſwer) what they have actually already confuted?*

He deſires we would let truth determine *us* againſt intereſt, favour, affection, and all other prejudices whatſoever. *And one would think he might have ſeen, that unleſs it did ſo, we ſhould not be Diſſenters. His capacity muſt be very ſmall, if he can't perceive on which ſide theſe things would turn the ſcale. A ſtranger would imagine, when he reads ſuch admonitions, we had all the Biſhopricks, Deaneries, Prebends, and fat Benefices in the kingdom in our hands. Could we make our conſciences pliable to our* intereſt, *we ſhould certainly take the ſame courſe he does. And* intereſt *would, if hearken'd to, as well work upon our People, as upon us who are Miniſters. And this argument our*

Adversaries upon occasion can tell how to use, when they dissuade our people from putting themselves to a double charge, by maintaining a Dissenting Minister, while the law obliges them to maintain the Parish Priest. And by whose favour *and* affection *would he have us not to be determin'd? Is it that of the government? Does he not know, his dear friends, who understood the influence these things have upon mens minds, have taken care we should be in no capacity of receiving any favour from them? Does he mean the favour of the people? What favour does he think we expect at their hands, besides what they have lately shown by insulting our persons, rifling our houses, and sacrilegiously plundering our temples? I suppose the Clergy, to whose influence these things are owing, were willing to convince us, favour and affection ought not to determine us to be Dissenters. He may please to be inform'd, we seek not the favour and affection of men, but of God only, by our separation.* Prejudices *and the* capricious humour *he talks of afterward, our Adversaries are as liable to, as ourselves; but in the general, they who act manifestly against their temporal interest, and professedly keep to the Scripture as their only rule, may be thought as little under such an influence, as any other men. I now request him, next time he is pleas'd to give his judgment in our Controversy, to abate a little of this assuming air; and to suppose, that he and his friends are not the only men in the world, that are mortified to* interest, favour, affection, and all other prejudices whatsoever; *but that his neighbours may with as good a grace, at least, pretend to this character.*

If I had authority to adjure you, *says he in the next Paragraph*, Whether you did really believe, that there are such errors either in the Doctrine or Discipline of the Church of *England*, as are inconsistent with salvation: I am persuaded that your consciences, after sufficient pains taken to be rightly inform'd, would answer in the negative. *What need of all this solemnity? Did we ever deny a possibility of salvation in the Church of* England? *That uncharitable way of judging mens states we leave to the Church of* Rome, *and their Brethren the High Church in* England. *We bless God, we have nothing to do with it. What need we then be* adjur'd, *to what we never deny'd? Well, but now see his inference.* But if there are not such dangerous errors, then there are not sufficient grounds for a separation. *And is not this a fit person, think we, to admonish the* Dissenters of all Denominations? *I will not* adjure *him, because the oaths of a certain sort of men have much lost their credit since the Revolution: but I put it to him; whether he is not of the same mind with many of his Brethren, that there is a possibility of salvation in the Church of* Rome? *If there is, according to his fancy,* there are not sufficient grounds for a separation from it. *Or if he sticks on that hand: I put it to him; whether he believes there is a possibility of salvation in the Church of* Scotland? *If there is, there are not sufficient grounds for a separation, and he must condemn his dear Episcopal Brethren on the other side* Tweed. *In short, if there is any sense in what he says, he must be a Papist in* Italy, *or a Presbyterian in* Scotland. *I thought sinful terms of communion had*

been a sufficient ground for separation, *even tho' there might be a possibility of salvation for those who ignorantly comply'd with them. However I will add, that I think a prodigious degree of weakness and ignorance, or a very bitter subsequent repentance, must be necessary, to make mens fixing the terms of communion according to the heart's desire of a Popish Prince consistent with salvation.*

In the next Paragraph he says: There are such strict obligations in the Gospel of Christ to unity (I mean Uniformity) in the worship of God; that a good man would think himself bound to join with the establish'd Church in any Christian country, wherever he should happen to sojourn or travel, except in cases of such dangerous errors aforesaid. *This is a fresh instance of his great penetration. There's an obligation to* unity; *but not one word in the Gospel of Christ to oblige us to* Uniformity *in humane devices. Who told him, that* unity *and* Uniformity *are one and the same thing? If they are, then there should be an Uniformity, not in an establish'd National Church only, of which not the least mention is made in the Gospel; but in the whole Catholic Church, the unity of which is so often spoken of. So that according to this argument, the Church of* England *has acted contrary to the obligations of the Gospel of Christ, by making her worship not uniform with other parts of the Catholic Church. He will oblige us, by telling us where those places, he refers to in the Gospel of Christ, are, that require the Uniformity of an establish'd Church. We know not where to look for them, except in the Act of Uniformity, which we hope is not become Gospel by being put into the Common Prayer Book.*

He

He says, he knows we will defend our selves by the examples of many celebrated persons of old, who thought it their duty to separate from the Church of *England*. *But he is mistaken again. We reverence those good men, whom his ancestors persecuted; but we no further follow them, than as we see they follow'd Christ. We dont approve the separation, because they practised it; but we approve of their practice, because we see it warranted by Scripture. In short, we call no man master, or father, on earth; our avow'd only rule is the Scripture; by that alone we will be convinc'd, by that alone we walk, as by that alone we shall be judg'd. He will now answer this argument, which he need not, since it is none of ours, but his own. However let us hear him:* But then there were greater numbers on the Church's side, as considerable, *&c. Were it so, yet we think they did evil, and we are not to follow a multitude therein.* Several of great reputation among the Dissenters have been reconcil'd to the Church: *And he might have added, that several of them carried the wounds, they thereby made in their consciences, to their graves. But these things all tend only to shew, that we cannot make any good mens principles or practices a rule for us, since they differ so much from one another, and that we must therefore consider things as they are in themselves.* several others have been withheld from conforming, not so much out of scruple at the doctrines and usages of the Church, as the conscience of obligations they lay under from the Covenant, Engagement, and other oaths, which had pass'd upon them to the contrary; which obligations die with the particular men that were bound by

them. *The* Engagement *stuck with none, that I know of. The renouncing the* Covenant *was an insuperable objection to many. But I hardly think any person ever declar'd, he had no other objection against the terms of Conformity. Nor is the business of the* Covenant *so light a matter, as he would make of it. For if the renouncing the* Covenant *was an unlawful term of Conformity, (as 'tis with me past doubt it was, in the terms they were requir'd to do it) their all Ministers were bound in conscience to have refus'd it; and consequently, they who impos'd it were Schismatical; and they who refus'd it were the only rightful and Catholic Pastors of the Church, according to the principles commonly laid down by our Adversaries. Now if the Churchmen were Schismatics at the beginning of the breach; 'tis not the death of the Catholics, that can clear them from any further guilt of Schism. They who are once Schismatics, must continue so till their repentance and reconciliation. I shall not take this Gentleman's word, for what he says* many of them, towards their latter end, exhorted their intimate friends and acquaintance to. *I dare say he was not their Confessor. Tho' if it be true, and they were not doting at the time, it signifies little to us, who judge by quite another rule.*

We know what mean arts have been practis'd upon some particular persons abroad, and what false representations have been made to them to persuade them to censure us. We fear not the judgment of any, who will now hear what's said on both sides. And I can assure him, upon my own certain knowledge, that several of our Brethren abroad, upon reading the Doctor's Defence of the Church

Church of *England*, *and my* Vindication of the Diſſenters, *have approv'd our practice, and incourag'd us in it.*

The reader will find an anſwer to the next Paragraph in the body of the Book. And therefore I ſhall here content myſelf, with only telling the Writer of the Preface, the eyes of the nation are too open not to ſee, that the little religion left in it lies moſtly among us, notwithſtanding their vaſt ſuperiority in numbers. And 'tis a ſign the beſt edification is there to be had, where men edify moſt. We are willing, the impartial ſhould *here* judge.

This Gentleman is pleas'd to tell us: There is no —— truth in that common pretence, that Men of different ſects of religion may, notwithſtanding, live very ſociably and friendly with one another. *Take a right High Church bigot indeed, and the thing is impoſſible. If men have ſo little ſenſe and manners, as to be condemning all thoſe to the pit of hell that are not of their mind, and muſt needs bring in their peculiarities in religion upon all occaſions, and impoſe them as healths upon every company, there's no living ſociably and friendly with ſuch; nor can I ſee the Diſſenters have any great reaſon to deſire their converſation. But what difficulty is there really in the thing it ſelf, for ſober modeſt men, that differ from one another in ſome matters, to converſe freely together about other things; nay, and to talk friendly with one another concerning the points in controverſy between them? For my own part, I can't find any backwardneſs to allow another man as much liberty of differing from me, as I expect to be allow'd me of differing*

from

from him. 'Tis therefore the easiest thing in the world for me to converse with sensible and civil people of all persuasions; and I have met with those, who I am persuaded found no more difficulty in it, than my self. The contrary to this, *he says*, is notorious by the woful experience of the present, and former ages. *He may see an instance of the contrary in* Polycarp, *and Pope* Anicetus, *mention'd in the Epistle of* Irenæus *to Pope* Victor, *who indeed seem'd to have been of this Gentleman's mind, but was very much blam'd for it. And who does not prefer the temper of* Cyprian, *who was for allowing every man to follow his own opinion without any breach of friendship and communion, to that of Pope* Stephen, *who renounc'd communion with all that differ'd from him? And really I can't see but that he must take the liberty of accusing the Apostle of a grand impertinence, in giving Christians advice to live sociably and friendly together, notwithstanding their differing about meats, and drinks, and days. For he may as well tell him, as us, that the thing is impossible.* And tho' some men, *says he*, have art and dexterity enough to carry a fair and plausible outside; yet the very countenances of others speak that animosity which they harbour in their breasts: *This is like enough to be true of furious bigots, but others need no art or dexterity to enable them to be easie and free in conversing with persons of a different opinion.* and as for children and servants, they never fail to own that strong disaffection, which they contract from what they commonly hear said against the contrary party.

party. *The truth is, not only the ſervants, but the Children of High Church are brought up to rudeneſs and ill manners. They are taught to be inveterate and abuſive to Diſſenters. For my own part I can ſay, what I believe moſt among us can ſay for themſelves; that tho' I endeavour to make my Children ſenſible of the reaſonableneſs of our diſſent from the Church of* England; *yet I ſtrictly charge them never to begin diſcourſes of that nature with any of another mind. And this I caution them againſt as a piece of ill breeding; for ſo it manifeſtly is. I wiſh High Church, whoſe Children are eaſily to be diſtinguiſh'd, would imitate us herein. But what will he infer from all this fine argument? becauſe men of different opinions can't live ſociably together, therefore they ſhould be all of one opinion? Very well, with all my heart, provided he and his party will come over to us. But I ſuppoſe this is ſtarted to ſtir up men to advance the glorious work of perſecution, that all may be brought to one opinion, in order to their living ſociably together. If the true reaſon of mens animoſities againſt one another be obſerv'd, 'twill be eaſy to find a much better way to put an end to them. When one ſect of men is ſuffer'd to oppreſs anotker, this naturally raiſes animoſities in both. The oppreſſed are inrag'd, upon the account of the oppreſſion they groan under: the oppreſſors are mov'd at the impatience of thoſe they trample upon, and hate them, becauſe they believe they would be glad to ſhake off their ungodly yoke. Now let every man enjoy his natural rights and liberties, and no one ſect be ſuffer'd to domineer over another; and difference in religion will be no lin-*

hindrance to mens living friendly and ſociably, as we ſee 'tis not at this day in Holland.

He tells us: He can bear with the warmth of the firſt Diſſenters —— but finds it harder to excuſe the moderns, who have ſeen thoſe conſequences [*of their zeal*] to be dreadful, and yet ſtill continue to ſay the ſame things. *Good Sir, dont trouble your ſelf: we neither ask, nor value your excuſe. We are well aſſur'd, thoſe bad conſequences lie not at our doors, but your own: and we fear not to give an account of our practice as Diſſenters, that will juſtify us in the ſight of God, and all reaſonable and impartial men. And pray turn this upon your own ſide: The firſt impoſers might not ſee the conſequences of their impoſitions; but who can excuſe the moderns, who ſee them, and will not, as they eaſily may, remove the cauſe of them?*

Certain it is, that ſo long as the public worſhip of God is among us, there muſt be ſome modes and forms attending it: *What then? are there not* modes and forms *enough appointed in the Scripture? Is there any neceſſity, that they who are for more, muſt require all others to an Uniformity with themſelves?* and wiſe men have ever held it moſt ſafe and warrantable, to keep to ſuch as were in uſe in the firſt and pureſt times. *Theſe* wiſe men *are himſelf and his party, the ingroſſers of all wiſdom. 'Tis pity their neighbours can have no ſhare with them. But pray which do you reckon* the firſt and pureſt times? *Is the fourth Century purer than the firſt, or the twelfth and thirteenth purer than both?* For whatever improvements have been made in humane arts and ſciences by later inventions; yet in religion, which always ſuffers by

by innovations, antiquity is most venerable, and of sacred authority. *This observation is worth all the Preface. Religion therefore, as describ'd in the Scriptures, without any of the innovations of after times, is to be prefer'd; and this is all we contend for. Keep to this rule, and our Controversy will be soon over. But the antiquity Dr.* N. *alledges, and the Church of* England *goes upon, is quite another thing, and takes in the innovations and improvements of many ages.*

This is what the Church of *England* always laid claim to, both in Doctrine and Discipline. *But her claim has always been disallow'd by the Dissenters. And as he adds, so do I too:* How justly, let the following Treatise determine.

And now he comes to applaud the Doctor: The ability, *says he,* of the Author, for a work of this nature, is well known to the world, by his learned and elaborate Comment on the whole Service Book of the Church of *England. I have had the curiosity to look a little into that Piece also; wherein are many of the same collections he had made for this* Defence. *So that I am apt to think, the reader may here meet with a confutation of the most he has there alledg'd, in behalf of the Church of* England, *in any of the points of controversy. As to the Doctor, he was, no doubt, a very ingenious man, and had gain'd no small reputation in the world by his writings. But whether he consulted his own credit, and did not mistake his own talent, when he undertook our Controversy, must be left to the judgment of the reader. I have always esteem'd it a vain thing to attempt to decide it by any, but Scripture arguments. Should we allow our Adversa-*

ries

ries had all the Fathers on their side, in every thing they contend for, our cause is nevertheless secure. This way of arguing does but needlesly lengthen out disputes; which might be much shorten'd, if men would be content to keep wholly to the Scriptures.

But when men will argue from Fathers, they ought to do it with great fairness; much care should be used to represent their true sense and design: whereas this is almost perpetually neglected in our Controversy; and a base abuse is put upon us, and the Fathers at the same time. As to the Doctor in particular I will say nothing, now he is dead, more than what I did in the Book, in the time of his life. There are many misrepresentations of other Authors here confuted, tho' they are not named; and the Doctor was sometimes, I believe, led into mistakes, by taking things upon trust from such writers as he had an extraordinary value for.

And he had his thoughts very much upon this piece, as appears from the many corrections he had made in the margin of the *Latin* edition. *'Tis pity the Translation had not been made from the Doctor's corrected copy. There are abundance of faults, which I had taken notice of, continued in the Translation; which one would hardly expect, if it had been made from a book carefully corrected by the Author. These corrections seem to be only some marginal references, added between Page 25, and 33.*

He had a design to publish it in *English*, and had translated the greatest part of it; but not living to finish the whole, it is now compleated in his own method, by a Divine of the Church of *England*. *'Tis not unlikely, the Doctor might have*

have some design of translating it, before he saw it answer'd. But I hardly think he would be so disingenuous, as to continue that design afterwards, when he had resolv'd upon making no reply. Nor can I believe he had gone far in his Translation. Being desirous to search a little into this matter, I thought of this way to do it: I consider'd, the Doctor made use of several Books, which were not very common, and which the Translator might probably not have. The Doctor's own Translation would, I was satisfied, run exactly in the language of the English *Authors he had turn'd into* Latin; *which 'twas probable the Translator's might not. I therefore resolv'd to compare the Translation with such of the Authors themselves, as I had by me. The first I light upon was the Doctor's citation out of Bp.* Hooper, *p.* 178, 179; *which I was sure was made from the* Latin, *and not taken from his own* English *words. I then look'd back to p.* 158, *and compar'd the two passages of* Gilby *with* Bancroft's Dangerous Positions, *p.* 56, *from whence they are cited; and the same still appear'd. I still went further back, and compar'd the pretended words of* Barrow, *set down p.* 37, *with the original in Sir* George Paul's Life of *Whitgift, p.* 67; *and found they were a translation. I went yet further back to p.* 28, *and compar'd the words there cited with the* Admonition: *and here I found the Translator had the* English *book before him. I then try'd whether the* Admonition *was cited in the latter part of the Book with the like exactness, and compar'd it with the quotation we meet with, p.* 246; *and there I found the Translator had not the* Admonition. *So that between*

between 30 *and* 40 *pages, at moſt, are here reckon'd* the greateſt part *of the Book,*

I will not conteſt with the Writer of the Preface, what commendation the Book deſerves. If it be the compleateſt of any of its bulk that is extant, as he ſeems to think; if it contains the ſum or chief of thoſe arguments, that can be brought for the cauſe it defends; I think the cauſe it ſelf muſt be a very bad one, which needs ſo much miſrepreſentation and fallacious arguing to diſguiſe it. And this confirms me in my perſuaſion, that the other, which I defend, has ſo much of truth and goodneſs in it, as will ſecure it, that the Gates of Hell ſhall never prevail againſt it; that it ſhall never be ſo vanquiſh'd, as not to revive again, and triumph over the malice of its enemies; that it ſhall be own'd and applauded, when human inventions in the worſhip of God ſhall be utterly aboliſh'd.

CONTENTS.

PART. I.

Containing the history of Nonconformity.

THE Dissenters join with Doctor Nichols *in appealing to Foreign Divines.* Page 1

His motives to undertake the defence of the Church, and the Author's reasons for writing this answer. 3

MCCCLX. Wicklief's *opinion: wherein the Dissenters agree with him.* 4

His followers persecuted. 6

MDIX. *King* Henry VIII. coming to the crown, continues the persecution. ibid

MDXXXIII. Cranmer *attempts a Reformation.* 7

MDXXXIV. *The Pope's supremacy abolish'd, and the King's establish'd.* ibid

MDXLVII. *King* Edward VI. his accession and Reformation. 10

Obstructed by the Bishops and Clergy. 12

Doctor Nichols's *panegyric on the Church examin'd.* 13

Reformation abroad vindicated. 14

Pretence of antiquity consider'd. 16

Mr. Calvin *vindicated.* 20

Bishop Hooper *persecuted.* 29

Many then of his mind. 32

Two sad instances of persecution. 33

MDLV. *Troubles at* Frankford, *with reflections thereon.* 35

MDLVIII. Reformation under Queen *Elizabeth.* 42
Hinder'd by 1. *her extravagant authority.* 43
2. *Her endeavour to please the Papists.* 48
3. *Their subtle tricks.* 51
MDLXII. *A Convocation reviews the Articles. Earnest struggles therein for reformation.* 53
Bishops without law require subscription. 55
MDLXIV. *The Queen stirs up the Bishops to persecute.* 56
The course they took. 57
Sampson *deprived.* 58
His and Humfrys's *submissive Letter.* ibid.
MDLXV. Whitgift *and other* Cambridge *Doctors Letter against persecution.* 60
Correspondence between the Foreign Divines and the English *on both sides.* ibid.
Persecution in London. 61
MDLXVI. *A Declaration of the Ministers of* London, *and its defence.* ibid.
Churches shut up for want of Preachers. 62
Parker *weary of persecuting.* 63
Letter from the general Assembly in Scotland *to the Bishops defended.* ibid.
MDLXVII. *A religious Assembly disturb'd.* ibid.
Forgeries of Cummin *and* Heath. 65
Controversy about Christ's descent into hell. ibid.
MDLXXI. *The Articles confirm'd by Parliament.* ibid.
Ministers turn'd out. 66
Beza *and* Martyr's *judgment concerning Conformity.* 67
Midwives allow'd to baptize. 69
Cartwright *vindicated against Dr.* Nichols *and Sir* G. Paul. 71
Grindal *stirs up persecution.* 78
Whitgift's *judgment and humanity.* 79
The two Archbishops persecute. 80
The troubles of Mr. Deering, ibid.
And Mr. Johnson. 82
MDLXXII. *Admonition to the Parliament defended:* 83
Begets a new Quarrel between Cartwright *and* Whitgift. 86
Attempts in Parliament for Reformation. 87
Account of the state of religion. 88

Ministers

MDLXXIII. *Ministers brought before the Council and Eccles. Commission; and imprison'd.* 88
Mr. Deering *vindicated,* 89
And Cartwright, *and the Puritan Classes.* 90
MDLXXVI. *An account of* Prophesyings. 92
Q. Eliz. *and Archbp.* Parker *enemies, but* Grindal *a friend to them.* 93
Grindal's *Letter concerning them.* 94
His trouble and submission. 95
Troubles of Gawton, 96
And Greenham. 97
Aylmer, *Bp. of* London, *persecutes: his temper.* ibid.
MDLXXXIII. *Archbp.* Whitgift *a furious Persecuter.* 100
MDLXXXIV. *Sets up an inquisition.* ibid.
Forbids Cartwright's *answering the* Rhemists. 101
Giffard's *troubles.* 103
Attempts in Parliament cunningly oppos'd by Archbp. Whitgift. 104
The Ministers present a Petition, and reasons for not subscribing, to the Convocation. 105
Stifled in the Bishops house. 106
Ministers urged to a stricter subscription than the Law requir'd. ibid.
The disorders of those times. 107
Cruel dealings with Ministers. 108
MDLXXXVI. Babington's *plot against the Queen and Puritans.* 115
Ministers present a Latin *petition to the Convocation.* 116
MDLXXXVII. *The Commons attempt a reformation:* ibid.
Hinder'd by the Bishops. 117
Bp. Burnet's *judgment of some things disliked by them.* ibid.
Martin Mar-prelate's *writings disapprov'd by the Puritans.* 118
Dr. N's *invidious turn given to the Puritans words.* 119
Leicester, Walsingham, *and* Knollis *vindicated.* 120
Character of Heylyn's *writings.* 122
MDXC. Whitgift's *tyranny, and* Cartwright's *sufferings.* 123

K. James's *Letter in his and* Udal's *behalf.* 127
Udal's *tryal.* 129
Travers *silenc'd.* 139
The story of Hacket. *Puritans not concern'd with him.* 140
Some account of Rob. Brown. 143
A Law against Conventicles. ibid.
Brownists persecuted. 144
The Execution of Thacker, Copping, Barrow, Greenwood, 145
Penry, 148
And Dennys, 151

MDCII. Puritans present the Petition with 1000 hands to K. *James.* 152
His Account of the Hampton Court *Conference:* ibid.
Different from Barlow's. 154
Bp. Rudd's *Speech in Convocation about the Cross.* 158
Reflections upon it. 163
MDCIV. *Persecution in* England *and* Scotland. 164
K. James's *inconstancy.* 165
The Episcoparians zealous to obtrude their Hierarchy and ceremonies. 166
Grown worse since. 167
Account of the Scots *Bishops.* 168
Archbp. Bancroft's *sly proceedings.* 169
MDCVII. *Mr.* Parker's *troubles for his treatise of the Cross.* 170
Dealings with the Scots, *particularly the two* Melvins. 171
Bancroft's *hypocrisy and cruelty.* 173
MDCIX. *Father* Paul's *account of* Chelsea *College.* 175
Liberty for Sports on the Lord's day. ibid.
Mr. Calderwood's Altare Damascen. ibid.
And troubles. 176

MDCXXV. Troubles in K. *Charles*'s reign. ibid.
Leighton's *troubles.* 177
MDCXXXIII. *Disputes about the Lord's day, and predestination.* 181
MDCXL. *Disputes about the prerogative. The Clergies fault therein.* 185

Their

	Their innovations. Articles againſt Bp. Wren.	189
	Baſtwick, Burton, *and* Prynne's *troubles.*	190
MDCXLI.	*The* Iriſh *Maſſacre.*	194
	Marq. of Antrim *clear'd by K.* Charles *the Second.*	195
	Burgeſs *vindicated.*	198
	Ld. Digby's *Speech concerning the Prelates.*	199
	Effects of the Civil War.	201
MDCXLIII.	*Solemn League and Covenant.*	203
	Epiſcopal Miniſters ejected.	204
	Weſtminſter *Aſſembly.*	205
	Riſe of the Independents.	206
	Mr. Cotton *vindicated.*	ibid.
	Acts of the Aſſembly.	208
	Why the Presbyterian Government is moſt readily received in cities.	211
	Caſe of Epiſcopal and Presbyterian Miniſters at this time.	212
MDCXLVIII.	*Presbyterians had no hand in the King's death.*	215
	Concerning the Hereſies of the *Inter-regnum.*	217
	Presbyterians attempt K. Charles *the Second's reſtoration.*	219
MDCLX.	King *Charles* the Second voted home.	220
	His diſſembling with the Miniſters.	ibid.
MDCLXII.	*An account of the Church of* England's *golden days.*	221
	Savoy *conference.*	223
	The Convocation has little regard to peace.	230
	Act of Uniformity.	231
	Presbyterian Aſſemblies: A barbarous Law againſt them.	235
MDCLXV.	*The plague.* Oxford *Oath.*	236
MDCLXXI.	*The King's indulgence accepted by Diſſenters.*	240
	A bill paſſes the Commons in favour of Diſſenters.	242
	Biſhops adviſe the King to perſecute.	ibid.
MDCLXXIII.	*The Clergy endeavour to ridicule the Diſſenters.*	243
	Controverſy between Sherlock *and* Owen.	245
	Jenkyn *and* Grove.	247
MDCLXXVIII.	*The Popiſh Plot diſcover'd, and the Parliament diſſolved.*	ibid.

Another

MDCLXXX. *Another called.* 247
A sham Presbyterian Plot. 248
Mr. Rich. Thompson *censur'd by Parl.* ibid.
The bill of Exclusion oppos'd by the Church. 249
Commons declare against persecution. 251
MDCLXXXII. *The persecution very severe.* 252
Vincent *condemn'd.* ibid.
MDCLXXXIII. Rye-house *Plot.* 253
Mr. Carstairs's *sufferings.* 255
The London *Cases.* 258
Mr. De Laune *suffers for answering one of them.* 259
Treatment of the French *Refugees.* 260
MDCLXXXV. K. *James* comes to the Crown. 261
Monmouth's *rebellion.* ibid.
MDCLXXXVII. *The King's Declaration for liberty of Conscience.* 264
The Dissenters behaviour vindicated. ibid.
MDCLXXXVIII. The Parliament give the Crown to K. *William* and Q. *Mary.* 271
The Dissenters address them. ibid.
The Act of Toleration. 272
A Comprehension hinder'd by the quarrels of the Convocation: 273
And not by the Dissenters. ibid.
Sir H. Edwin *defended in carrying the Mace to a Meeting, when Lord Mayor of* London. 276
The Answer to Mr. Burscough *defended.* 279
MDCCI. Q. *Anne* succeeds. 281
Dr. Calamy's *Abridgement:* ibid.
Begets a Controversy between him and Hoadly *and* Ollyffe. 282
Concerning Occasional Communion. 283
A Caution to our Arbitrators. 285

CONTENTS.

PART II.

Concerning the Doctrine of the Church of *England*.

INtroduction.
Dissenters need no colour for their Separation. p. 291
Reflections on the writers upon this controversy: ibid.
And on the Doctor's encomium upon the Church. 292

CHAP. I. Of Popery charg'd on the Church of *England*.
General observations concerning this accusation. 294
Puritan writers vindicated in urging it. 296
Dissenters favour'd not Papists. 298
The weakness of Dr. Nichols's *pleas from the Papists putting the Bishops to death.* 299
The gunpowder plot. 300
K. James's *proceedings.* 301
The forgeries of Cummin *and* Heath. ibid.
The Clergies subscriptions. 302
The Dissenters opinion of symbolizing with Papists. ibid.
Their practice vindicated: 303
By the example of Hezekiah. 304
Some Bishops and Presbyters popishly affected. 306
Dr. N's *excuse for them frivolous.* 311

CHAP. XIII. Concerning Nonresistance.
Nonresistance the doctrine of the Clergy, 313
And Convocation, 314
Deserted at the Revolution. 315
Dissenters vindicated in accepting K. James's *liberty.* 316
Dr. N's *apologies for the Clergy examin'd.* ibid.
Reasons why Dissenters sided with some Courtiers in disgrace. 318
The power of the magistrate, how from God, and how from the people. 319
The original contract defended. 320
The Clergy incouraged tyranny. Not excus'd in preaching Nonresistance, by the time, 322
Or the Parliament's requiring them to subscribe it, or their ignorance of the laws. 323

PART

CONTENTS.

PART III.

Concerning Discipline, and Modes of Worship.

CHAP. I. Of the government of Bishops.

The opinions of both sides. p. 327
The Episcopal order not instituted by Christ. 329
The Apostles not Bishops. 332
Of St. James's *being Bishop of* Jerusalem, 335
And Stephen's *being his Deacon.* 337
Epaphroditus *no Bishop. What* Ἀπόστολος *signifies. Dr.* Whitby's *opinion examin'd.* 338
Jerom's *notion of an Apostle.* 341
Titus *not Bishop of* Crete, 343
Nor Timothy *of* Ephesus. 346
Arguments from antiquity without Scripture insufficient. 349
Testimonies of the antients consider'd. 351
Dr. N's *Defence of the Bishops civil honors and offices examin'd.* 366
These condemn'd by the antients, 368
By Tindal, Cranmer, 370
Latimer, Hooper, 371
And many others. 373
Dr. N. *mistaken about the extent of antient Churches.* ibid.
Jerom *no defender of Episcopacy.* 378

CHAP. II. Of Deans and Chapters.

Their jurisdiction intrenches upon the pretended rights of Bishops. 379
These Dignities why held by some Puritans. ibid.
Not justified by antiquity. 380
Other reasons for them examin'd. 381
Their rise. Calvin's *judgment of them.* 384

CHAP. III. Of Singing and Music in Churches.

Dissenters no enemies to vocal music. 385
What the virtue of instrumental music is. Why used in the Temple, 386
And not in the Christian Church. 387
Antiphonal singing, when first used; 389
Disliked by some of the antients. 391
And the English ecclesiastical commissioners. 392

Organs

Organs when first used in the Church: 392
Why retain'd in some foreign Churches. 395
Condemn'd by the Homilies: Oppos'd in Convocation: 396
Condemn'd by some Papists. 397

CHAP. IV. Of the public Liturgy.
The Dissenters opinion. 398
Their way of praying vindicated. 400
Advantages of it compar'd with those of the Liturgy. 403
No pattern of a Liturgy in the primitive Church. 406
The Doctor's opinion of the Apostolic age consider'd. 407
Testimonies from the antients examin'd. 410
Whence the English *Liturgy is taken.* 426
The Liturgies of Basil, &c. *spurious.* ibid.
Difference between the English *Liturgy and the prayers of the antients.* 427
Testimonies of the antients using free prayer. 428

CHAP. V. Of the sign of the Cross in Baptism.
The opinion of Conformists and Nonconformists concerning it. 434
The antiquity of it examin'd. 437
The Doctor's plea for continuing it unreasonable. 442
Some confessedly superstitious about it. 443
The present use differs from the antient. 445
Whether sacramental. 446

CHAP. VI. Of Godfathers and Godmothers.
State of the controversy. 449
The sense of the antients. 450
The Doctor's arguments answer'd. 453
The objections of Dissenters vindicated. 454
Arguments from state examples answer'd. 455
Reflections upon St. Austin's *fancy.* 457

CHAP. VII. Of Confirmation.
The judgment of Dissenters. 459
Confirmation not warranted by Scripture. 460
When and how used by the antients. 463
Concerning the Minister of Confirmation. 473
Whether used as a sacrament. 475

CONTENTS.

CHAP. VIII. Of the Surplice, and other Eccleſiaſtical Habits.

The Diſſenters judgment. 476
Of the uſefulneſs of theſe Garments. 479
No diſtinction between a ſacred and profane garb. ibid.
Why the Diſſenters uſe a Cloak. 480
Scripture arguments for the Surplice examin'd, ibid.
Thoſe from the cuſtom of nations, 481
And from antiquity. 482
Not antiently uſed. 485
What it ſignifies. 486

CHAP. IX. Of the Ring in Marriage.

What our controverſy here is. 487
Teſtimonies of Tertullian *and* Auſtin *examin'd.* 488
The ſenſe of thoſe Words, With my body I thee worſhip. 489

CHAP. X. Of Kneeling at the Sacrament.

State of the controverſy. 489
Example of Chriſt and his Apoſtles. 490
Whether Church rulers may require kneeling. ibid.
The difference between Chriſt's ſitting and ours. 491
Communicants may be more than twelve. 492
Sitting not an indecent poſture. 493
What poſture beſt reſembles a feaſt. 495
Charge of ſymbolizing with Socinians retorted. 496
Kneeling not requiſite in token of humility. 497
The practice of the antients. ibid.

CHAP. XI. Of the obſervation of Holidays.

The Diſſenters opinion. 501
The Doctor's arguments from Scripture refuted. 505
No ſuch Holidays in the three firſt ages. 507
Of the number of Feſtivals. 508
Riſe of the feaſt of Annunciation, Nativity, 509
Circumciſion, 512
Purification, Reſurrection, 513
Aſcenſion, Whitſunday, the Apoſtles, 514
Chriſt, the Martyrs, 515
John *Bapt ſt,* 516
Stephen, *Converſion of St.* Paul; Mark, Luke, Michael. 517

The Fasts, particularly the Eves, 518
Lent, 521
Ember weeks, 529
Rogation days. 530
Whether these days are not contrary to the fourth Commandment ibid.

CHAP. XII. Of Bowing at the name of *Jesus.*
The Dissenters opinion. 531
The Churchmens practice formerly, and now, different. ibid.
The argument answer'd from civil respect, 532
From the worship due to Christ. ibid.
This custom not charg'd with idolatry : 533
By whom used. ibid.
The meaning of Philip. ii. 10. 534
Of worshiping toward the altar. 535

CHAP. XIII. Of reading Apocryphal books in the Church.
The state of the question. 537
Difference between the Articles and the Homilies. ibid.
The ill effect of reading them publicly. 538
The sense of the antients. 539
A frivoolus excuse, that they are not read on Sundays. 542
Whether they exclude a part of Canonical Scripture. 543
Whether Bell *and the* Dragon *is a pious allegory.* 545
The History of Susannah *counted fabulous by* Jerom ; 546
Not quoted by Clement. ibid.

CHAP. XIV. Of the Church's Homilies, and Ministers Sermons.
Homilies now seldom read, and why. 548
Dr. N. *unreasonably condemns all earnestness in preaching.* 549
The Churchmen inconstant, sometimes commending us, sometimes our predecessors. 551
We honor Mr. Baxter, *and our own Divines.* 552

CHAP. XV. Of the Faults found with the *English* Liturgy.
The frequent repetition of the Lord's Prayer. 554
The Prayer, to be deliver'd from fornication, and all other deadly sin. 555
The Office of burial. ibid.
The Confession too short and general. 557

The alternate reciting the Psalms. 558
Repeating the Creed. ibid.
The Litany. ibid.

CHAP. XVI. Of the Discipline of the Church of *England.*

The great want of discipline acknowledg'd. 559
What divisions hinder discipline. 560
The defects of discipline with reference to Ministers, 562
And Parishioners. 565
Concerning Archdeacons, ibid.
And Archbishops. 566
A Specimen of the Church's laws: 567
Mild toward the Papists, severe upon the Puritans. 569
Of Excommunication, 570
And commutation of Penance. 571
The CONCLUSION.

A VIN-

A VINDICATION OF THE *DISSENTERS*: OR, AN APPEAL TO FOREIGN DIVINES, PROFESSORS, and all other LEARNED MEN of the *Reformed Religion*.

PART I.

Reverend and Dear BRETHREN,

IN reading Dr. *Nichols*'s book, I could not but often wonder, our Episcoparians should, at length, appeal to you. And when I consider how very differently they have been accustom'd for a long time to treat Foreigners, I cannot forbear congratulating you this new friendship. We wish it may prove lasting, not being apprehensive of any ill consequence from such Arbitrators. We have always desir'd that *Aristocratical* form of Church Government, which

you have deſervedly made choice of, as moſt conſonant to the holy Scriptures: we have earneſtly pleaded for the abrogation of thoſe rites and ceremonies, which you have of your own accord laid aſide: and we are well aſſur'd of your approbation of thoſe articles of faith, which the Diſſenters have always teſtified a regard to; but which our Conformiſts (tho' they ſubſcrib'd to them) have miſerably rack'd and tortur'd, to make them favour the Arminian and Jeſuitical ſcheme, in ſpight of the ſenſe of the compoſers of them, and the plain ſenſe of the words in which they are expreſs'd. You therefore, Brethren, muſt firſt quit your old ſentiments, before you can honeſtly cenſure us. However we can't but take it a little amiſs of theſe gentlemen, that they ſhould hypocritically endeavour to beguile and impoſe upon our Brethren abroad. 'Tis well known, they who chuſe Arbitrators pretend, they are willing to refer the whole matter in controverſy to their arbitration. But we are well aſſur'd, our Adverſaries are determin'd to abide by their old reſolution, which they have been long accuſtom'd to expreſs in the words of our antient noble Barons, *Nolumus leges Angliæ mutari: We will admit of no alteration in the* Engliſh *laws.** And tho' ſome few excellent perſons in the Eſtabliſhment, may be deſirous of having our controverſy determin'd by your judgment; yet they will never be able to perſuade their brethren to refer the matter to you. Dr. *Nichols* freely acknowledges, *It has been in vain, when they have try'd to bring their party to a healing temper.*† And the reaſon is, becauſe the High Church always oppoſes the advice and counſel of the Low, who are much the feweſt in number. And truly I can't ſee, that any great matters can be expected from Arbitrators. For if they will vouchſafe to give a verdict according to the hearts deſire of the Conformiſts, they will look upon it as deciſive of the controverſy; but if they ſhould chance to determine any thing in our favour, they will right or wrong contemn their judgment, and inſult the Arbitrators. But for our parts, we promiſe to ſtand to the choice they have made, only upon this one condition, that we be underſtood to reſerve the ſame power of judging of the arbitration, which we are very ſure our Adverſaries will never part with. And I am much miſtaken, if we have not ſtronger

* *See Dr.* Nich. p. 121. † *See* Pag. 133.

ſtronger reaſons than they to inſiſt upon this. For, are not thoſe things accounted *indifferent* by our Adverſaries, which we eſteem grievouſly ſinful? Let any man then judge between us. What ſhould hinder the aboliſhing ſuch things, which, if tolerable, and however unleſs? If the peace of the Church, and brotherly agreement may be promoted by ſuch an alteration, what hurt could there be in it? But as to us, every one muſt ſee, 'tis not in our power to hearken to any Arbitrators, who would perſuade us to worſhip God in a way our conſciences diſapprove; and we are ſatisfied our Brethren abroad will never put us upon it. However, ſince Dr. *Nichols*, under the mask of friendſhip, has endeavour'd to expoſe us to the hatred and cenſure of our Foreign Brethren, equity and juſtice require they ſhould hear what we have to ſay in our own Defence.

Dr. *Nichols* is pleas'd to ſay, *That which prevail'd with him, in particular, to ſet about this work, was the earneſt perſuaſions of ſome very worthy perſons* *; nor can it be any great wonder, if ſome ſuch ſhould have put him upon writing; however, many are apt to think, he was forward enough himſelf in the undertaking. This I am well aſſur'd, a very eminent Biſhop deceas'd, and a learned Dr. in Divinity, ſtill alive, had his Book put into their hands to peruſe, before 'twas printed, and both of them earneſtly diſſuaded him from printing it, but could not prevail. But for my own part, I can truly ſay, I was earneſtly ſolicited to the work, which I was utterly averſe to, and endeavoured all I could to perſuade ſeveral, who put me upon it, to undertake it themſelves, knowing they were much better qualified for ſuch an undertaking. However, finding they wanted either leiſure or inclination, I at length yielded to their requeſt, altho I was very ſenſible under what diſadvantages I undertook the work; and more particularly becauſe I knew long diſuſe had render'd me more unfit to write in the learned language, with the politeneſs and elegancy, which ſuited both the cauſe I was to defend, and the reputation and character of the perſons to whom I was to addreſs my ſelf. But this was my ſtedfaſt reſolution from the firſt, that how much ſoever I ſhall fall ſhort of Dr. *Nichols* (the Latin Secretary to the *Society* for the *Pro-*

* p. 55.

pagation of the Gospel) in elegancy of stile, I would abundantly make amends for in the exactness and faithfulness of my accounts of matters. And since truth is not to be discern'd by the fineness of the language, but by the weight and strength of the arguments which are urg'd; our Brethren are earnestly desired rather to regard the force of the arguments than the manner in which they are express'd.

Dr. *Nichols* has perfix'd an *Historical Introduction* to his *Defence*. I shall first correct the mistakes he runs into in that part; and then try the strength of those arguments, whereby he endeavours to defend his cause: and, upon the whole, any of our brethren abroad may be able to form a true notion of that Church, which some are pleas'd so highly to extol, and give a more exact and just judgment about our Controversy.

If any regard is to be paid to the judgment of MCCCCLX. *Wicklief*,* whom our Author highly and deservedly commends, 'twould be but decent in our Adversaries to treat us with more moderation; since 'tis certain he agreed with us, in the chief matters in dispute between us and the Conformists, as these following Testimonies will abundantly prove.

Of the Degrees, *and* Offices *of Ministers.*

" The holy doctors were of opinion, that 'tis superfluous in the sacrament of Orders to allow more than " two degrees, *viz.* Deacons or Levites, and Presbyters " or Bishops; for these two degrees were thought sufficient under the old law, which more abounded with " sacraments. In *Paul*'s time, two orders of Clergymen were thought enough for the Church, *viz.* Priests " and Deacons: the other degrees are the inventions of " imperious pride.†

" Civil government should not be committed to the " clergy.‖

" 'Twould be good for the Church, if there were " neither Pope, nor domineering Prelate; and that the " Church were free from their traditions, as it will be after the day of judgment.‡ " Con-

* Pag. 2. † *Fascic. rer. expet. & fug. Tom. I.* 269. Thom. Wald *in* Fuller, pl 132 *Catal. Test.*, *Tom* 2. p. 810. ‖ *Catal. Test.* ibid. ‡ *Fascic.* 270.

" Confirmation, the giving orders, and the consecra-
" tion of places are reserv'd to the Pope and Bishops, for
" the sake of temporal gain and honour. *

That the Holy Scriptures *is the only Rule of* Faith, *and* Worship.

" Let a Christian hearken to reason and Scripture,
" and not such extravagant, and groundless fables concern-
" ing the power of the Prelates. †

" All human traditions, which are not taught in the
" Gospel, are superfluous and wicked.——'Tis not law-
" ful to use, learn, or teach any other law, than that of
" Christ; and whoever uses any law, that does not lead
" directly to happiness, exposes himself by such use to
" damnation.——'Tis not lawful for a Christian, after the
" full publication of the law of Christ, to devise himself
" any other laws for the government of the Church. ‖

" That wise men leave that as impertinent, which is
" not plainly express'd in Scripture.——That he slighted the
" authority of General Councils. ‡

Of Rites, *and* Ceremonies.

" He wholly rejected all human rites, and new sha-
" dows or traditions.——He thought Cathedrals, and all
" that pomp of the Pope's worship, together with the va-
" rious degrees of the Clergy, ought to be abolish'd. *

" That all beautiful building of Churches is blame-
" worthy, and savours of hypocrisy. †

" 'Twould be very much for the advantage of the
" Church, that the building of Cathedrals, and stately
" churches, and the several religious Orders, should be
" laid aside, as they will be done in the day of judgment. ‖

" That Chrisme, and other such ceremonies, are not
" to be us'd in baptism. ‡

" If the ceremonies of the old law were to cease under
" the law of grace, because of their burdensomeness and
" number; how much more should such traditions of

* *Artic. against* John Wickliff *in the Counc. of* Const. *Sess.* 8. *Art.* 28. *See* Fuller *also*. † *Fasc.* p. 274. ‖ Ibid. p. 276. ‡ Wald *in* Full. * *Catal. Test.* † Wald. *in* Full. ‖ *Fasc.* p. 279. ‡ Wald. *in* Full.

" men, as are devis'd without any Scripture foundation,
" ceaſe in the time of that law of grace?——Circumciſion,
" and the ceremonies of the old law, are not to be obſerv'd
" by Chriſtians, much more the modern ceremonies, in-
" troduc'd contrary to both the old and new law. *

Of Vigils, *and* Forms *of* Prayer.

" That to bind men to ſet and preſcript forms of
" Prayer, doth derogate from that liberty God hath given
" them.——That men are not bound to the obſervation
" of Vigils or Canonical Hours. †

" 'Twould be an advantage to the Church, to be re-
" ſtor'd to her antient liberty; and that all the ſolemni-
" ties of additional Maſſes, and the prayers for Canonical
" Hours might be laid aſide. ‖.

Of Predeſtination.

" He defin'd the Church to conſiſt only of perſons
" predeſtinated. ‡

The followers of *Wicklief* were always vex'd with a moſt grievous and cruel perſecution. And 'tis eaſy to obſerve, the things they were troubled for, were ſuch wherein they perfectly agreed with us: ſuch as their ſpeaking againſt Holidays, the obſervation of Lent, Pluralities, the ſinging Service, *&c.* as may be ſeen in Mr. *Fox's Matyrology.*

MDIX. The perſecution ceas'd not in King *Henry* the VIII's time, who was an implacable enemy to the Reformation, and wrote ſharply againſt *Luther*, wherein he ſo pleas'd the Pope, that he beſtow'd upon him the title of *Defender of the Faith.* But being a moſt laſcivious prince, and weary of his wife, he ſtudied how to put her away, that he might marry one whom he better liked, and grievouſly reſented the hindrance he met with, from the Pope, in his deſign. And when he was wearied out with the intrigues and delays of the Papal court, he reſolved at the inſtigation of *Cranmer* (afterward A. B. of *Canterbury*) to ſhake off the yoke, and to get the Pope's power veſted in his own perſon. After this, by the help of his own Biſhops,

* Faſc. *p.* 270. † Wald. *in* Full. ‖ Faſc. *p.* 269, ‡ Wald. *in* Full.

Biſhops, appointed judges in his affair, he, without any difficulty, got rid of his wives, juſt as he pleas'd. We can never enough adore that infinite wiſdom, which overrul'd his wicked diſpoſition, and turn'd it to the advantage of religion, and the deſtruction of Papal tyranny among us. Nor can the Papiſts have any great cauſe to upbraid the Reformation with his character, when they conſider, to what a monſter of an Emperor their head is indebted for the title of *Univerſal Biſhop*. However, King *Henry* continu'd a deadly enemy both to the Reformation and the Papal tyranny; and they, who avow'd either of theſe, ſuffer'd death in his reign.

Cranmer being made Archbiſhop of *Canterbury*, MDXXXIII. gladly embrac'd all opportunities of promoting the Reformation; and his intereſt in the King's favour might have been more ſerviceable, had it not been for the intolerably ſuperſtitious and obſtinate temper of the King, the craftineſs of *Gardiner*, Bp. of *Wincheſter*, and his own timorouſneſs. Had not *Cranmer* been chargeable with timorouſneſs, he would not have had a hand in putting martyrs to death. Dr. *Fuller* tells us, the Archbiſhop argued with *Lambert*, though civily, ſhrewdly againſt the truth, and his own private judgment. * But I muſt own, I think Mr. *Strype* clears him of that, and ſhews that at that time he himſelf believ'd the doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation. † But 'tis eaſy to obſerve much of this temper appearing in that account, which he gives of him. However this is certain, that the ſtate of religion was very deplorable during his reign, as appears by the *Six Articles*, eſtabliſhing *Tranſubſtantiation, Communion under one Kind, the Celibacy of the Clergy, Vows of Chaſtity, Private Maſſes, and Auricular Confeſſion.*

Our author next gives an account of the taking away of the *Pope's Supremacy*. ‖ To which I would MDXXXIV. add, that King *Henry* always ſtudied how he might inlarge his authority, and increaſe his treaſure; and upon theſe motives, chiefly, diſſolv'd the religious houſes, and put an end to the Papal tyranny among us. And if the temper of the man be conſider'd, 'tis no great wonder, he ſhould endeavour to poſſeſs himſelf of that power and authority, which he took away from the Pope. But 'tis neceſſary to look a little farther into this, that we may the

* *Church Hiſtory, Book* 5. *p.* 229. † *See* Cranmer's *Life, p.* 66, 67. ‖ *p.*

better understand the supremacy of our Kings; which is a matter of great moment in our Controversy, however slightly and superficially the Dr. afterwards treats of it, *p.* 347. In the 37th year of his reign, a law was made which declares: "That Archbishops, Bishops, Archdeacons, and other ecclesiastical persons have no manner of jurisdiction ecclesiastical, but by and under the King's Majesty, the only undoubted supreme head of the Church of *England*, to whom, by Holy Scripture, power and authority is given to hear and determine all manner of causes whatsoever, and to correct all sin and vice whatsoever."

Hence sprang those offices of Chancellors, Commissaries, and the like, who were never heard of in that primitive Church, about which our Adversaries make such a continual stir. For King *Henry* being resolv'd to shew his subjects, what authority he intended to assume, and that he might try their obedience, committed the most important ecclesiastical judgment to Laymen. Our Adversaries continually tell us, that Christ committed the government of the Church only to the Bishops. Let them then shew us, how, consistantly with that notion, they can allow the power of excommunication and absolution to belong to such officers as are not Bishops, but perfect Laymen; and who proceed, not by the direction of the Bishops in what they do, but act upon their own heads, and oftentimes against the will of the Bishops.* The King therefore, according to our *English* laws (which in some respects they would have to be unchangeable, like those of the *Medes* and *Persians*) is the only fountain of all ecclesiastical authority and jurisdiction; nor have the Clergy, of whatsoever order or degree, any other power than what they have deriv'd from him: and the Bishops rule the churches, ordain and administer Sacraments as his ministers. Whence also Bishops are chosen by the King, and consecrated upon his command. He may ordain if he please, or appoint whom he will, Presbyters or Laymen, to perform that office; and can, whenever he has a mind, resume that power, which he delegated to any of them. If any object, the King's power is bounded by the laws of the land: I answer, 'tis true; nor do I pretend

* *See Bp.* Croft's *Naked Truth*, p. 64. *Bp.* Burnet's *Life of Bp.* Bedel, *p.* 88, 89.

tend he can do any thing, but with the consent of his Parliament, who alone can set limits to him in these things. Whence in the reign of King *William*, not only Presbyters, but Bishops, and among them the Archbishop of *Canterbury* himself, were, by an Act of Parliament, depriv'd of their functions. This power seems to have been given to our Kings, from the beginning of the Reformation, with the approbation and advice of Archbishop *Cranmer*. That he was himself of this opinion, appears by a manuscript of his, still preserv'd, and by the account given of his proceedings.

The same ecclesiastical power of our Kings was confirm'd in the reigns of King *Edward* the VI. Queen *Elizabeth*, King *James* the I. and King *Charles* the II. excepting that in Queen *Elizabeth*'s time, the title of *Supreme Head* was chang'd to that of *Supreme Governour*. Nay farther, all Clergymen of whatever order, before the late happy Revolution, were oblig'd to swear to the truth hereof. For thus run the words of the *Oath of Supremacy*: "I, *A. B.* do utterly testify and declare in my conscience, that the King's Majesty is the only supreme governour of this realm, and of all other his Highness's dominions and countries, as well in all spiritual and ecclesiastical things or causes, as temporal. —— And therefore I promise from henceforth I shall bear faith and true allegiance to the King's Highness, his heirs and lawful successors, and to my power shall assist and defend all jurisdictions, priviledges, preheminences granted, or belonging to the King's Highness, his heirs and successours, or united and annexed to the imperial crown of this realm. So help me God, &c. Whether our Parliaments have rightly determin'd in these matters, let every one judge as he sees cause: I would only make this one remark by the by; that our adversaries can have no great cause of objecting against us a want of authority. For if the King's Majesty be (both according to the laws of the land, and the oath which they used formerly to take) the only fountain of all ecclesiastical authority and jurisdiction within his dominions, and can delegate ecclesiastical authority to whom he pleases; it would be very strange, if that should not be valid authority and jurisdiction, which we use in our Congregations, by his permission and approbation.

That

That book of *The Inſtitution of a Chriſtian Man*, which our Author ſo highly commends, * is intirely on our ſide, in acknowledging only two orders of Miniſters inſtituted by Chriſt; nor can it in any other reſpect be interpreted to the diſadvantage of it. It was at firſt compos'd, or at leaſt approv'd by thoſe men, who, in the reign of King *Edward*, drew up the Articles of religion. If therefore there were any conſiderable difference in the doctrines contain'd in thoſe two writings, in the latter they muſt certainly be thought to give their judgment more freely, becauſe in the reign of King *Edward*; and more exactly too, becauſe it was upon farther deliberation.

MDXLVII. King *Henry* was ſucceeded by his ſon, King *Edward* the VI. a prince of a moſt excellent and pious diſpoſition, who, being but ten years old at his father's deceaſe, was free from his prejudices, obſtinacy, and ſuperſtition, and was more forward to hearken to Archbiſhop *Cranmer*, and the duke of *Somerſet*, who put him upon advancing religion. Under his reign therefore the Reformation made a more conſiderable progreſs, than it had done before. The groſs ignorance of the parochial Clergy put our Reformers not only upon drawing up *Homilies*, (as the Dr. acknowledges †) but *Forms of Prayer* alſo; they being ſenſible the Clergy were incapable of compoſing themſelves either prayers, or ſermons. And as they intended, by little and little, and without any diſturbance, to wean the people from their ſuperſtition; they ſo order'd the matter, as that they might ſeem to have tranſlated the antient forms into their mother tongue, rather than to have wholly laid them aſide. And ſo at length came out the *Engliſh Common Prayer*, taken out of the *Maſs Book*: abundance of the Popiſh ſuperſtitions were indeed left out; but, if we will ſpeak the truth, ſeveral were continued. This will not ſeem ſtrange, if we conſider, that the firſt diſcoveries in ſearching for the truth, and the firſt eſſays in any noble work, are uſually moſt imperfect. Thus the firſt edition of the Common Prayer retain'd Anointing, the very frequent uſe of the ſign of the Croſs, the commending the ſoul to the divine mercy in the burial Office, the Popiſh Garments, and

* p. 6. † p. 10.

and ſome other ſuch things. But yet every one muſt acknowledge, that imperfect alteration of the publick worſhip, was a very conſiderable advantage to religion. Nor do I find, the Diſſenters uſe to blame theſe excellent perſons, for the pains they took in compoſing Homilies and forms of Prayer, for the help of the then miſerably ignorant nation. Our Reformers were far from thinking their own work abſolutely perfect: and we are told by one, they left in their preface to the Book, a paſſage, ſignifying, "They had gone as far as they could in reforming the Church, conſidering the times they liv'd in, and hoped they that came after them would, as they might, do more." * I have not had an opportunity of examining the truth of this paſſage; but however am ſatisfied, they eſteem'd their work capable of improvement, becauſe they actually, in the ſame reign, ſet forth another edition of the Book, much more free from ſuperſtition than the former. However it ſtill retain'd the Popiſh Veſtments; the ſign of the Croſs in baptiſm; and that manner of Prayer, which they receiv'd from the Papiſts, and muſt ſeem odd to thoſe, who compare it with the Liturgies of the Foreign Churches. 'Tis not unlikely they would have alter'd theſe things, if they had had another opportunity of doing it. And indeed, Biſhop *Burnet* tells us, *Cranmer* and *Ridley* deſign'd to have procur'd an act, to aboliſh the Popiſh Garments.

The Conformiſts differ very much in their ſentiments about our firſt Reformers. Dr. *Heylin*, Mr. *A. Wood*, and thoſe of their ſtamp, reckon them to have *defac'd* rather than *reform'd* religion; others unmeaſurably extol their work, as the moſt compleat and every way perfect, being compos'd by ſuch excellent and pious martyrs and confeſſors; laſtly, others (with whom the Diſſenters agree) go a middle way, and think, as God is to be greatly prais'd for raiſing up ſuch perſons, ſo they have deſerv'd much commendation, not only that they happily advanc'd the Reformation ſo far as they did, but that they had an inclination and deſire of carrying it on much farther. They think too, if there are ſeveral things amiſs, and that needed alteration of ſuch as came after them, great allowances ſhould be made for the darkneſs of the times

* *Troughtons* Apol. P. 40.

times in which they liv'd, and the common infirmity of mankind, (who are all liable to miſtake) and the many difficulties and diſcouragements they met with from the Papiſts, and ſuch as were popiſhly affected, or wretchedly indifferent about the matter. 'Tis certain, they who openly declar'd themſelves for Popery were very turbulent at that time, and ſtir'd up a rebellion in ſeveral parts of the nation; others who were in diſguiſe acted more covertly, endeavouring to get as much as they could of the old ſuperſtition retain'd, hoping, by this means, to keep open a backdoor for the return of the reſt. The unhappy influence of their counſels appear'd too plainly in the fall of the noble duke of *Somerſet*, a moſt hearty friend to the Reformation, and who deſerv'd a much better fate. Nor can it be wonder'd, if ſuch perſons could embarraſs the affairs of religion in King *Edward*'s time, ſince they could do it in Queen *Elizabeth*'s, as I ſhall have occaſion to ſhew from Biſhop *Burnet*.

The oppoſition and indifference our pious King *Edward* met with, was a great diſcouragement to him. Sir *John Ellyot*, a worthy gentleman in the Parliament, *An.* 3 *Car.* I. ſaid: "That he had ſeen in a diary of King "*Edward* the VI. that the Biſhops at that time, ſome "for ſloath, ſome for age, ſome for ignorance, ſome for "luxury, and ſome for Popery, were unfit for diſcipline "and government." * Mr. *Strype* has likewiſe publiſh'd a letter of *Peter Martyr*'s to *Bucer*, wherein he writes: "That Archbiſhop *Cranmer* told him, it was reſolv'd in "a conference of the Biſhops, that many things ſhould "be alter'd. But what, ſays he, they particularly were, "he did not declare, nor dar'd I ask him. But what Sir "*John Cheke* told me, does not a little comfort me, that "if the Biſhops would not alter the things that needed "alteration, the King would do it himſelf, and interpoſe "his own authority at the meeting of the Parliament." † And truly I can ſee no reaſon to queſtion the truth of what is related in the Hiſtory of the troubles of *Frankfort*: "That *Cranmer*, Biſhop of *Canterbury*, had drawn "up a Book of prayer an hundred times more perfect "than this that we now have; the ſame could not take "place, for that he was matched with ſuch a wicked "Clergy.

* Ruſhw. *Collect.* Pt. I. p. 649. † *Life of A. Bp.* Cranmer, App. p. 154.

" Clergy and Convocation."* Which passage Mr. *Strype* speaks of, as pretended to be the words of *Bullinger*, and handed about, as such, by the discontented exiles at *Frankfort*;† whereas it was really the report of one of *Cox*'s side, and he reported it upon his own knowledge, and not upon the testimony of *Bullinger*, as is plain to him who looks into the book itself.

I pass over what he says of the Articles, and the reflections he makes upon the doctrine of the *Calvinists*, it not belonging to our Controversy as Dissenters; though I am well assur'd the Dr. did not serve his purpose, by mentioning those things in the manner he has done, as some of the Foreign Divines let him know in their letters to him.

Let us now come to the Drs. panegyric upon his Church: *And now*, says he, *our Church shone forth with a lustre superior to any other branch of the reformation.*‖ But the Dr. should remember he is too much a party concern'd to be a judge in this cause. And since he has chosen our Brethren abroad to be Arbitrators between us, 'tis but decent to leave it to them to give judgment between us. *The Papists look'd upon us with a greater degree of envy, than upon the rest of the Protestants.* The expression is here better qualified than in the Latin edition, wherein he represents the Papists as envying the Church of *England* alone. But the case is plain, that they envy all Protestans their liberty, and seek to deprive them of it. And if the Dr. thought, they envied them the perfection of their model, he seems to have been much mistaken. They have used to deride them for retaining so much of Popery as they have done, and have triumph'd therein (and truly I think justly) as a vindication of several of those things, which they have laid aside. *And all other Reform'd Churches admir'd us.* And without doubt so did the Church of *England* them. And the Reform'd Churches then, as dear sisters, heartily lov'd one another. And if the Episcoparians, since Archbishop *Laud*'s time, have accustom'd themselves to despise the form of government in the Foreign Churches; they have no great reason, on the other hand, to flatter themselves, that their own is in any great reputation with our Brethren

* p. 60. † Cranm. *Life*, p. 266. ‖ page 13.

thren abroad. But our Author subjoins the reasons of their admiration; asserting 'twas, *Because our Reformation was not carry'd on, as in other places, by the mad zeal and tumults of the people, when oftentimes seditious men, under the pretence of piety, gave disturbance to the state. But our Reformation was quietly advanc'd by the wise counsels of both Houses of Parliament and Convocation; who maturely consider'd how they might restore that purity to religion, which the primitive ages enjoy'd; how they might free it from that heap of ceremonies with which Popery had loaded it, and yet not, by stripping it of every graceful rite, to leave it too poor and lean.** Hearken now, our learned Judges! Behold now the vile original of your Reformation! See what *a poor and lean thing* you have made of your *religion, by stripping it of every graceful rite!* Can you be at a loss for a verdict? Don't you see plainly, you have nothing else to do, but to condemn that *poor lean religion*, which is *strip'd of every graceful rite*, sprung from *the mad zeal and tumults of the people*, and the deceitful *pretences of seditious men:* I say, that you should condemn *that* religion, though it be your own, that you may with a good grace give judgment on our Adversaries side? Good Sir, Is this your mannerly way of pleading the cause of your Church of *England?* What? Do you yourself first appoint the Foreign Divines Arbitrators in our Controversy, and then plainly and scurrilously abuse them, and their religion, and that before they have given judgment? The Papists indeed commonly upbraid us, that our *English* Reformation sprung from King *Henry*'s breeches: but what true Protestant, nay who but a rank Papist, ever open'd his vile mouth before, to utter such things against the Foreign Churches? Such vile calumnies are only fit to come out of the mouth of a malicious, superstitious, and lying Jesuit: but are utterly unworthy of a Presbyter of the Church of *England.* But where, I pray, did the *people* break out into this *mad zeal?* In what quarter of the world are we to discover these ungodly *tumults?* What *seditious* men do you talk of? What stirs did they raise? And what were their feign'd *pretences?* If the states of our realm set themselves to reform

* P. 14.

reform religion among us, that must be esteem'd an instance of our happiness, rather than the perfection and purity of our Reformation. And if in other places they not only declin'd, but endeavour'd all they could to hinder that blessed work, will this rare advocate of the Church of *England* venture to blame the people, for attempting it by themselves? What an impudent, foolish, and wicked people then must the followers of *Wichlief* have been, who ventur'd upon a reformation, without either House of Parliament or Convocation to lead them!* How much more pious and wise were the people, who in the reign of *Henry* the VIII. waited the Parliament's and Convocation's leisure, contenting themselves in the mean time with a superstitious and idolatrous worship! What a vile and ungodly generation were the primitive Christians, according to this man's notions; that receiv'd a new religion, without the encouragement of any of the states? How much more prudent were they, who embrac'd Christianity in the fourth age of the Church, at the command of publick authority! I would fain know, why the common people are to take no care to save their souls? What hurt is there in it, if the common people endeavour to worship God without superstition, and in that way which is pleasing to him? Certainly the antient Christian writers did not use to despise the people after this fashion. *Cyprian*, whom our Adversaries frequently commend, was of quite another mind: "I resolv'd, *says* "*he*, from my first being Bishop, that I would do nothing "of my own head, without your [*i. e.* the *Presbyters* "and *Deacons*] advice, and the consent of the people.† And elsewhere thus: "Nor let the people flatter themselves, as though they could be innocent, who communicate with a wicked Priest, and give their consent to "the unjust and unlawful administeration of their governour."‖ And having cited *Hos.* ix. 4. and *Num.* xvi. 26. he immediately adds: "Wherefore the people, in "obedience to God's commands, and the fear of God, "must separate themselves from a wicked ruler, and not "concern themselves in the religious acts of a sacrilegious priest; " (*and if the Popish Priests are not such, there are none in the world*) "since the people especially "have

* *See* Dr. *Nichols*, p. 2. † *Epist.* 14. p. 33. ‖ *Epist.* 68. p. 171.

" have the power lodg'd in them of chuſing ſuch Prieſts " as are deſerving, and refuſing ſuch as are not." But our Adverſaries will perhaps reject this holy Father's authority in this caſe, as they do when they pleaſe, and appeal to more antient teſtimonies. By all means: I am ſenſible what antiquity they muſt have recourſe to. I acknowledge this doctrine of theirs, of deſpiſing the common people, is deriv'd to them from the moſt antient times, even from their venerable predeceſſors. For this Diſcourſe of the Doctor's is exactly of a piece with that of the Scribes and Phariſees: *Have any of the rulers believ'd on him? but this people*, [this rabble rout] *which knows not the law, is curſed.** Oh but, ſays the Dr. *Both Houſes of Parliament and Convocation maturely conſider'd how they might reſtore that purity of religion, which the primitive ages enjoy'd.* Very well: and what did *they maturely conſider* abroad, but how that purity might be reſtor'd to religion, which it enjoy'd in its firſt inſtitution? Without all doubt, if purity muſt be determin'd by antiquity, the more antient any thing, the purer it is; and therefore the Reformers, in foreign parts, were beſt adviſ'd, who took the Holy Scriptures for their only rule and guide in the work of reformation. But farther I would remark, that our Author's aſſertion is utterly falſe. The Conformiſts retain many uſages, of which there are not the leaſt footſteps in the antient writers. Nor does Dr. *Nichols* deny this afterwards, when he comes to treat of particulars. On the other hand; there were many things in uſe among the primitive Chriſtians, which they have rejected. Whence Dr. *Whitby* taxes them with *hypocriſy* in making ſuch a pretence.† Finally, I deſire our Arbitrators would take notice that religion is reckon'd by the Dr. a *poor and lean* thing, when 'tis *ſtripp'd* of, what he calls, its *graceful rites*. I confeſs, I could not but wonder, how ſuch an expreſſion could drop from him. Our Adverſaries uſe to talk of their rites, as *indifferent* things. And when from the words of our Saviour, *In vain do they worſhip me, teaching for doctrines*, [*viz.* about worſhip] *the commandments of men, Matth.* xv. we clearly demonſtrate, that it is unlawful to worſhip God with any rites, however indifferent in themſelves, if they are not preſcrib'd by God; they uſed to ſhelter themſelves under this poor evaſion, that the Scribes

* John vii. 48, 49. † *Proteſt. Reconciler, Part* 1. p. 297, 298.

Scribes and Pharisees prescrib'd their rites as necessary; whereas the Church of *England* prescribes not hers as necessary, but as indifferent, upon the taking away of which, religion it self immediately becomes a *poor and lean* thing. Whence it plainly appears, the precepts of the Pharisees, and our Gentlemen of the Hierarchy, are both built upon the same foundation, and deserve equal respect and obedience. And let not our Brethren wonder, we are stiff about these things. Experience convinces us, when men have brought into the worship of God, vain and trifling ceremonies of their own devising, they presently dote upon them as their own offspring, even to the neglect of the far greater and *weightier things of the law.* Thus we have seen drunkards, whoremongers, prophane swearers and cursers, (who, in imitation of the *Jews*, have been continually crying, *The Church, the Church* *) fondly careſt by them; while sober and virtuous men have been grievously vex'd, and persecuted for their aversion to the *English* ceremonies.

But the Dr. goes on: *'This extraordinary prudence of our Reformers was, upon many accounts, commended by all good men: but upon this more especially, because they thought fit to retain the discipline and ceremonies which were us'd most antiently in the Church, and to abrogate those only which were introduc'd under the Papal usurpation.* Several of the ceremonies, retain'd by our Adversaries, were never us'd in the antient Church. They are not able to alledge any tolerable antiquity for the Surplice, the Cross in Baptism, kneeling at the Sacrament, their Saints Days, and many other Holidays. I wish we were certainly appriz'd, what that antiquity is, which is so venerable in the esteem of our Adversaries. Sometimes it stretches it self to a monstrous extent, and reaches from the first beginning of the Church to almost our own times; at other times again it is so curtail'd, that you have hardly any number of years left to be dignified with the name of antient. When our Adversaries think 'tis for their purpose, it shall come down as far as the twelfth or thirteenth age of the Church: I am sure, our Author pretends no greater antiquity for the Feasts of St. *Mark* and *Luke*, *p.* 311. The fourth and fifth Centuries are very commonly taken in, as parts of this venerable antiquity: altho' our Adversaries cannot deny, that the

* Jer. vii. 4.

groſſeſt ſuperſtition about the Martyrs, relicks, and innumerable ceremonies (complain'd of by *Auguſtine*)* grew up at that time in the Church. I cannot, upon this occaſion, omit the words of the learned Mr. *Whiſton*, in his excellent *Eſſay on the Revelation*: "Any plea from antiquity, which "yet reaches not earlier than the beginning of the corrupt "and Antichriſtian times, is of no value in the diſputes "about religion; but rather a ſign and argument that "thoſe doctrines and practices, which can be trac'd no "higher, are Antichriſtian and falſe, or at leaſt ſuch as "made way, by degrees, for what was moſt certainly of "that character.†" And in another Piece, which he publiſh'd ſoon after that, he ſpeaks more fully thus: "Generally "we pay the greateſt deference to thoſe later Fathers of "the fourth and fifth Centuries, which liv'd not till near "the times of Antichriſt, and at ſomewhat remote diſtan-"ces from our Saviour and his Apoſtles; and ſo are more "properly to be accounted as the firſt and moſt valuable of "the modern writers, than among thoſe who are of great "authority for their truly primitive antiquity." ‖ I confeſs this author has publiſh'd an odd judgment of ſome of the antient writers, but theſe two pieces were written and cited by me, before he fell into that opinion; and there appears ſuch good ſenſe in the paſſages ſet down, that I could not be willing to leave them out. But what a different opinion have our Conformiſts of this matter? Thus when Mr. *Daille* paſs'd a complement upon the Church of *England*, declaring, "He judg'd the Confirmation ſhe us'd, "was more prudently order'd, and better agreed with the "nature of the Chriſtian religion, than what we find, by "the writers of the fourth and following ages, to have "been then practis'd in the Church:" What ſays the learned Bp. *Beveridge* in anſwer? "Truly this is more than "the Church of *England* ever aſſum'd to her ſelf, ‡"

But farther, as to the antiquity of our Adverſaries; ſometimes they are ſo ſtrait lac'd, that they will not allow that honour to the third Century, which, upon other occaſions they are free to give to the fourth and fifth. Thus when we argue: They may as well bring in Infant Communion, as many other things in uſe among them, ſince it

---

* Epiſt. ad Januar. † *p.* 202. ‖ Accompl. of Script. Prophſ. *p.* 33. ‡ Cod. Can. Eccl. Primit. vind. in Proœm.

it appears to have been practis'd at leaſt from *Cyprian*'s time, thro' many ages of the Church: they anſwer us: That *Cyprian* is not an author antient enough for ſuch a cuſtom to be brought in upon his authority. Nay, ſometimes they muſt exclude the ſecond Century from being any part of the antiquity they pretend to pay ſuch a deference to. Why elſe have they laid aſide the mixing water and wine in the cup in the Lord's Supper, which *Juſtin Martyr*, who flouriſh'd in the middle of the ſecond Century, teſtifies was in uſe in his time; and which *Cyprian*, in the next age, labours to prove to be abſolutely neceſſary? Nay, if they will be conſiſtent with themſelves, while they pretend to be directed by antiquity, in reſtoring purity to religion; they muſt not allow themſelves to take the very firſt Century into their antiquity. I forbear to mention the twofold Order mention'd in the Holy Scripture, and by *Clement* of *Rome*. I only deſire to know where we ſhall find that purity, which *Clement*, who liv'd in the Apoſtles days, witneſſes was in the Churches of his time; that Biſhops and Deacons were appointed with the conſent of the whole Church? *

But ſome perhaps may imagine I bear too hard upon the Dr. ſince he ſeems to confine the antiquity he regards, to the times that preceed *the Papal uſurpation*. But I anſwer: The Doctor ſeeks to impoſe upon his readers: for if that be the only valuable antiquity in his eſteem, to what purpoſe has he heap'd up, in his Book, ſuch a multitude of teſtimonies of authors, who liv'd under the Papal uſurpation? Beſides, I would fain know, how antient he reckons the *Papal uſurpation* to have been; and whether he thinks it ſprung up in an inſtant, or by little and little? If we ſuppoſe it was come to ſome maturity in the year 606. when the Emperor *Phocas* declar'd the Pope the *Univerſal Biſhop*; yet we muſt be ſtrangely unacquainted with the Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory of the two foregoing Centuries, and particularly of the times of Pope *Leo* I. if we can believe there was no Papal uſurpation before *Boniface* III. in the Days of *Phocas*.

But let us for once imagine that the *Papal uſurpation* is only to be dated from the year 606. and that all the preceeding ages are to be reckon'd venerable antiquity; yet with

* Epiſt. to the Corinth. c. 44.

what face can men pretend the Church of *England* is govern'd by a regard even to this sorry antiquity? Kneeling at the Sacrament, musical Instruments in the worship of God, and several other things in use among them, are the inventions of later and worse times then that beginning of Papal usurpation. But let it be granted (since our cause will afford our being liberal) that all the usages of the Church are warranted by the best and most antient of uninspir'd writers. What earnings can they make of such our concession? Can even such an antiquity be the rule of our faith, or worship? Nay does not that very antiquity commend to us the Holy Scriptures, as our only rule for both? Let *Cyprian* be judge in the case: "The custom "which has crept in among some, must not hinder truth "from prevailing; for custom, without truth, is but "the staleness of error. And that Christ only is to be "heard by us, the Father witnesses from heaven, saying, "*This is my beloved Son, hear him.* Wherefore, if Christ "only is to be heard, we must not regard what another "person, before our time, has thought fit to be done; but "we are to consider what Christ has first done, who is "himself before all; for we are not to follow the custom "of men, but the truth of God."* Let us hear *Tertullian* likewise to the same purpose: "We cannot lawfully bring "in any thing at our own pleasure, nor chuse what any "one else has brought in after that rate. We have the "Apostles for our vouchers, who never chose to bring in "any thing according to their own fancy, but faithfully "deliver'd to the nations that discipline, which they themselves receiv'd from Christ?"† Well but, may some say, does not antiquity recommend that form of government which our Reformers retain'd? Certainly Chancellors, Commissaries, Deans, Archdeacons, Prebendaries, and the exorbitant power of Bishops, are not to be discover'd in any antiquity worth regarding. No, nor yet the Monarchical form of ecclesiastical government, if we judge by the remotest antiquity, as will be evidenc'd in its proper place.

Our Author, in the next place, falls hard upon Mr. *John Calvin*, ‖ a bright ornament of the Reform'd religion, and the age in which he liv'd. Nor is it any wonder he should, by little stories and pitiful misrepresentations, endeavour

* Epist. ad Pomp. *p.* 215. † De Præscr. c. 6. 232. ‖ *p.* 15.

vour to blacken his pious memory; for these Gentlemen have accustom'd themselves to treat every body, who will venture to vary a hair's breadth from them, after that manner. Whether Mr. *Calvin set the Members of the Church of* England *a quarrelling with one another*, according as he asserts, I will enquire presently, when I come to examine what is alledg'd concerning Bp. *Hooper*. Let us now follow the Doctor.

This learned man [Mr. *John Calvin*] *seem'd to be griev'd, that the discipline which he had set up at* Geneva, *could not be so much valued, when a Reform'd Episcopacy was establish'd in* England, *which would recommend it self to other Protestants beyond his form; especially whereas his invention could only be excus'd from the particular necessities which the city of* Geneva *lay under, but our Episcopal government was warranted by the practice of all antiquity.* But how could the Dr. know that *Calvin* was griev'd upon any such account? *Calvin* says no such thing of himself, nor do any signs thereof appear. "How then comes this notable inquisitor (that I "may use his own words elsewhere) to know what "Mr. *Calvin* hid in the secret receſſes of his heart? This "can be known to God only, to whom all hearts are open; "for any mortal to pretend to such knowledge, is an impi-"ous invasion of the divine prerogative."* 'Tis pretty odd too, the Dr. should represent *Calvin* as griev'd to think, that the *English* Episcopal form of government would *recommend itself to other Protestants beyond his form.* This is an improvement of the *English* Translation, there being no such clause in the *Latin* edition. But why may not Mr. *Calvin* be allow'd to have as good an opinion of his form, as any of the friends of the Hierarchy have of theirs? If this form of government was, as our Author pretends, Mr. *Calvin*'s invention; he would, without doubt, have been as ready as others to perswade himself it would meet with approbation, till he saw plain evidence to the contrary. And had there been so much as one little hole or corner of the Reform'd world, beside the King of *England*'s dominions, that had ever shew'd itself enamour'd with our Episcopal form of government, as long as *Calvin* liv'd, this passage might seem to have been inserted with a better grace. But when Protestants every where prefer'd his

* p. 171.

ſcheme, to that of our Reformers on this ſide the water, this grief, he would father upon *Calvin*, muſt ſeem unaccountable; and if ever he had any ſuch grief, I muſt own he was not by far ſo great a man, as I uſed to take him to be.

Farther, our Author, in tranſlating this paſſage, has put *his invention*, inſtead of *the novelty of his invention*; for which I blame him not; for had it been Mr. *Calvin*'s *invention*, it muſt have been new. But I would fain know what new invention he would charge upon Mr. *Calvin?* Lay Chancellors, to whom the judgment of the weightieſt matters is committed, are indeed a *new invention*, never heard of, I ſuppoſe, before the time of *Henry* VIII. But the Ariſtocratical form of Church government can in no other ſenſe be call'd *new*, than that, in which the Teſtament of our Bleſſed Saviour, is ſo term'd. If *Jerom*'s opinion of the identity of Biſhops and Presbyters be reproach'd with novelty, not only muſt Mr. *Calvin*, and the reſt of the Reformers abroad, but all our *Engliſh* Reformers too, fall under that guilt. For I am apt to think, 'twill not be eaſy to find one of them, who held Biſhops were by divine appointment ſuperior to Presbyters. And when they retain'd the Epiſcopal government, they never pretended to do it as a thing of neceſſity, by virtue of a divine command, but only as a matter of prudence.

But perhaps the Dr. had his eye to Lay Elders particularly, as the novel *invention* of Mr. *Calvin*. But not to alledge *Hilary* the Deacon, who, by very learneed men is thought to mention them: *Cyprian* informs us, that in his time the affairs of the Church were order'd, not only with the advice of the Biſhop and Presbyters, but of the People: nay even Mr. *Dodwel*,* the moſt zealous advocate for Epiſcopacy, proves there were ſome Presbyters in *Cyprian*'s time, who were not Teachers or Preachers. And indeed I think it muſt be evident to any one, there were in the antient Church many Presbyters, who did not uſe to preach, or teach publickly in the aſſembly; and yet this diſtinction did not make any difference among them, as to their right of voting, or as to their intereſt in the government of the Church. But let that matter be as it will, the Church of *England* ought not, for ſhame, to upbraid Mr. *Calvin* with his

* Diſſert. Cypr. VI. §. 4, 5, 6.

his Lay Elders, as long as they allow Lay Chancellors, Commiſſaries, and Officials. Nay the beſt of our Reformers ſeem to have quite another opinion than our Author of theſe Elders, and to have only wanted an opportunity to bring in the uſe of them here in *England*. *Cranmer*, and the reſt of the Commiſſioners in K. *Edward* the Sixth's time, drew up a Body of Laws, which, if they had been ratified, would have bid fair for the bringing theſe Lay Elders, or ſomewhat equivalent, into uſe among us. To which purpoſe is this law of theirs: "After even-" ing Prayers, on which all ſhall attend in their own pa-" riſh Churches, the principal Miniſter or Parſon, and the " Deacon, if they are preſent; or, in caſe of their abſence, the " Curate, and *the Elders*, ſhall conſider how the money gi-" ven for pious uſes may be beſt laid out; and then let diſci-" pline be exercis'd: for they, whoſe ſin has been public, " and given offence to the whole Church, ſhould be brought " to a ſenſe of it, and publickly undergo the puniſhment " of it, that ſo the Church may be the better for their corre-" ction. After that the Miniſter ſhall withdraw with ſome " of *the Elders*, and conſult, how all other perſons, who " are diſorderly in their life and converſation, may be talk'd " with; firſt by ſome ſober and good men in a brotherly " manner, according to the direction of Chriſt in the Goſ-" pel; and if they hearken to their advice, God is to be " prais'd for it; but if they go on in their wickedneſs, they " are to be reſtrain'd by that ſevere puniſhment, which is " in the Goſpel preſcrib'd for ſuch obſtinacy." * And ſince this was their opinion, there is more reaſon to think they were hindred, by *particular neceſſities*, from appointing Lay Elders, than that Mr. *Calvin* was from ſetting up Epiſcopacy. And indeed I would fain know what were thoſe *particular neceſſities, which the city of* Geneva *lay under*, which were the *only* things could *excuſe his invention?* Our Author is not conſiſtent with himſelf, for he preſently tells us: *Mr.* Calvin *manag'd the affairs of religion in his own country with an uncontroulable authority, whereby he became impatient of any contradiction in theſe matters.* What *particular neceſſities* could hinder him, who *manag'd the affairs of religion with an uncontroulable authority?* If Mr. *Calvin* had ſo great an *authority*, what *neceſſity* could force him

* Reformat. Leg. Eccl. p. 45.

to change the form of government among them? Could not our Author see, that those necessities, whatever they were, would rather have ingag'd him to have made as little alteration as possible, since they would render the setting up an intirely new form of government a much more difficult thing, than the retaining and mending of the old. I could never yet guess, what were those laws of necessity, which our Adversaries make such a perpetual noise about; and which (I am sorry to say) some have at length been found in *Geneva* willing to acknowledge. And indeed tho' they talk of them, in the general, yet they never care to mention them in particular. Mr. *Calvin* himself never pretended any such necessity for what he did. "Besides, *says he*, that our own conscience acquits "us in the sight of God, the thing it self will answer for "us in the sight of men. No body has yet appear'd, "that could prove we had alter'd any one thing, which "God has commanded; or that we have appointed *any* "*new thing* contrary to his word; or that we have turn'd "aside from the truth to follow any evil opinion. On the "contrary, 'tis manifest we have reform'd our Church "meerly by God's word, which is the only rule by "which 'tis to be order'd and lawfully defended. 'Tis in-"deed an unpleasant work to alter what has been former-"ly in use, were it not that the order which God has "once fix'd, must be esteem'd by us as sacred and invio-"lable; insomuch that if it has for a time been laid aside, "it must of necessity (and whatever the consequences "should prove) be restor'd again. No antiquity, no pre-"scription of custom may be allow'd to be an obstacle in "this case, that the government of the Church, which "God has appointed, should not be perpetual, since the "Lord himself has once fix'd it." * Nay, if Mr. *Calvin* had been so yielding to necessity, as our Author pretends, he must have took quite another course than he did; nor would there have been any occasion for him, and his two Collegues, *to be commanded within two days to depart the city, for refusing to administer the Lord's Supper.*† Mr. *Calvin* often withstood, not only the people, but the Senate, and some of his Brethrem in the ministry; and being restor'd to the Church of *Geneva*, he *desir'd nothing*

so

* Letter to a certain Curate, *p.* 282. † Beza's Life of Calv.

so much, as that ecclesiastical laws, agreeable to the word of God, might be establish'd with the consent of the Senate. * And who can doubt, but that Mr. *Calvin* could have easily perswaded the Church of *Geneva* to restore Episcopacy? Certainly it must have been easier for him to obtain that, than it was to perswade them before to set up the Presbyterian form. In short 'tis false, that Mr. *Calvin* was constrain'd by any other necessity, than his own apprehension of a divine command, to abrogate Episcopacy and establish Presbytery in the city of *Geneva*. And I wish our Adversaries, instead of dunning us with the assertion of this necessity, would produce some credible witnesses, or clear arguments to prove it.

But our Author goes on: *And perhaps the mind of that otherwise very holy man was sower'd towards us, by some particular resentments with relation to himself. For Mr.* Calvin, *who manag'd the affairs of religion in his own country with an uncontroulable authority, whereby he became impatient of any contradiction in these matters, therefore could not easily digest, that the assistance, which he had offer'd in carrying on the Reformation in* England, *was not accepted by Archbishop* Cranmer. *For that most judicious person did with very great wisdom think, that our* English *people would more easily bear the faults in the Church to be amended by their own Bishops, than by a Foreign Divine, especially by one who was by some thought too officiously to have offer'd his service therein.* † Mind this now, ye *Foreign Divines*, and beware ye do not *too officiously offer your service.* If that was the mind of the Hierarchical Gentlemen in Mr. *Calvin*'s time, I'll secure you they are no changelings now; nor will they ever endure to have any one single error of their Church amended according to your judgment. Nor does it signify, that they themselves ask your advice; for they acted the same part of old with Mr. *Calvin*. By this you learn what sort of Arbitrators you are like to prove.

Our Author has indeed done very great injury to the memory of those great and good Men, Mr. *Calvin* and Archbishop *Cranmer*. In reading the works of Mr. *Calvin*, and particularly his Epistles, one every where discovers a great deal of candour and moderation. Archbishop *Cranmer* and our other Reformers were never asham'd to desire the

* *Ibid.* † p. 15.

the advice of Foreigners: they invited therefore those famous Divines, *Bucer* and *Matyr*, made them Professors in our Universities, and gave them handsome salaries. Nor did they consult only with them, but with several other Divines abroad, and particularly Mr. *Calvin*. Among his Epistles there is one of the Archbishop's to him, respectful enough, for ought I see. * But by Mr. *Calvin*'s answer it appears the Archbishop wrote to him several times. † But neither the Archbishop, nor any one of our Reformers, ever said Mr. *Calvin* was too officious in offering his Service: this is the base device of some of our modern Churchmen. How kindly and respectfully Mr. *Calvin*'s letters were receiv'd in *England*, appears by the account which he wrote to his friend; and it being a full detection of the falshood of these mens pretences, I will translate the beginning of the Letter. "*Nicholas*, *says he*, is at "length return'd from *England*, —— he tells me, he "was so kindly receiv'd there, that I have good reason to "congratulate my self in the pains I have taken: when "he had deliver'd my Letters to the Duke of *Somerset*, "and told him he had others for his Majesty, he of his "own accord offer'd to deliver them to him, and accord-"ingly went to court the next day. Unless I am great-"ly deceiv'd, my present was acceptable to His Majesty's "Council, and very much rejoyc'd the King himself. *The* "*Archbishop of* Canterbury *sent me word, that I could not* "*do any thing more useful, than to write frequently to the* "*King*. This pleases me much better, than if I had a "great sum of money bestow'd upon me." ‖ Who now will believe, that *the assistance which Mr.* Calvin *offer'd in carrying on the Reformation in* England, *was not accepted by Archbishop* Cranmer? Nay, if Mr. *Calvin*'s Letter to the *Protector* be compar'd with the alterations made in the second edition of the Liturgy in King *Edward*'s time. it will plainly appear, our Reformers paid a great deference to his judgment. Praying for the dead at the Lord's Supper, Chrism, and extreme Unction, were very frankly blam'd by him in that Letter; and all these were left out in that second edition, according to his advice. And Dr. *Heylyn* declares, those alterations were made upon his instigation.

* *p.* 268. † *See p.* 61. ‖ Epist. ad Farell. *p.* 240.

ſtigation.* Nor does Dr. *Nichols* elſewhere himſelf deny it. For thus he ſpeaks of the latter edition of the Liturgy in King *Edward's* time: "Four years afterwards, the "Book of Common Prayer underwent another review; "wherein ſome ceremonies and uſages were laid aſide, and "ſome new Prayers added, at the inſtance of Mr. *Calvin* "of *Geneva*, and *Bucer*, a Foreign Divine, who was in-"vited to be a Profeſſor at *Cambridge*. †"

Mr. Calvin *taking offence at theſe things, in his letters to ſome of his friends, made uſe of ſome very hard expreſſions with relation to the Church of* England, *and which did not ſo well become the mouth of a Divine.* ‖

Mr. *Calvin* ſpake his mind freely, as became an honeſt man. And perhaps his harſheſt expreſſions are thoſe mention'd elſewhere by the Doctor, *that the Engliſh Liturgy contain'd many tolerable fopperies*, which he alſo called *the relicks of the dregs of Popery*. And certainly this was a very mild cenſure, in compariſon of that ſcurrilous and abuſive way, in which the Dr. as we have ſeen already, treats the Foreign Churches. Theſe expreſſions of Mr. *Calvin did not become the mouth of a Divine*: but we muſt imagine the Doctors reproaches were worthy of a Divine, and a Presbyter of the Church of *England*: *That the poor lean religion*, of Proteſtants abroad, *ſtrip'd of every graceful rite*, was owing to the *mad zeal and tumults of the ſeditious people, who under the pretence of piety gave great diſturbance to the ſtate*. I wiſh theſe men, who make ſuch a ſplutter about antiquity, would a little better guard againſt the antient proverb: *Phyſician heal thy ſelf*.

And in one to Martin Bucer, *a very modeſt and peaceable man, who was then coming into* England, *he warns him againſt being* the author or approver of middle counſels; *by which words he plainly ſtrikes at the moderation obſerv'd in the* Engliſh *Reformation*. 'Tis evident, *Bucer* was actually in *England* when *Calvin* wrote that Letter to him; and the Tranſlation here is in that reſpect worſe than the original. Now ſince Dr. *Nichols* juſtly repreſents *Bucer* as of the ſame opinion with *Calvin* in doctrinals, *p.* 180. he muſt neceſſarily be underſtood here, as ſuppoſing that *Calvin* had a reſpect to ceremonies and Church government in this paſſage of his Letter. But herein the Doctor con-

* Hiſt. of the Presbyt. *pag.* 12, 207. † Comment on the Book of Com. Prayer, *Pref. p.* 5. ‖ *p.* 16.

contradicts Dr. *Heylyn*, who, from this very sentence, pretends that those two Reformers were not agreed in their doctrinal opinions. To whom Mr. *Hickman* gives this answer: " *Bucer*, by his very best friends, had been " charg'd at *Zurich*, *An.* 1533, for speaking too doubt- " fully in the doctrine of the Sacrament, thro' a desire " to appease *Luther*; he then and there made such an " apology for himself, as was accepted. If, at his coming " over into *England*, he fell into the same fault, Mr. " *Calvin* did but the part of a Christian to admonish " him." *

And that Mr. *Hickman* best understood *Calvin*'s mind is confirm'd by *Beza*, who says: " That when *Bucer* was " in *England*, *Calvin* honestly advis'd him to write and " speak more clearly concerning the Lord's Supper; and " at the same time gave the Duke of *Somerset* (who was " afterwards most unworthily put to death) such advice, " as, if it had been follow'd in that kingdom, would " probably have freed the *English* Churches from abun- " dance of calamities." † Nay and *Calvin* himself, in that Letter to *Bucer*, sufficiently clears his own mind. " In this matter, *says he*, I differ from you, that you " think those of the contrary opinion are wrong'd and " misrepresented. For while you can't think they could " ever err so grosly, as to think Christ was present in " all places, you don't consider what *Brentius*, among " others, has written; that Christ, while he lay in the " manger, was glorious in Heaven, even with respect to " his body. What means that *adorable Sacrament*, *Luther* " talks of, but that an idol is to be set up in the temple " of God? Concerning *place*, you seem to me to dis- " course too curiously. Others are offended at that ob- " scurity, which they think you craftily and industriously " use. I know these are in the wrong: but I don't see " what reason you have so much to avoid what we " profess, that when Christ is said to have ascended " into heaven, hereby is signified a distance of places." I would not suspect our Author as a friend to *these middle counsels*: but supposing that *Calvin*, in those words, had a regard to Church government and ceremonies, what harm is there then in them? *Those middle coun-*

* Histor. Quinquart. Exartic. *p.* 471. † Life of Calvin.

counsels, whoever was the author of them, have been far from doing service to the purity of religion, or peace of the Church. And if the Church of *England* had quitted those middle counsels at the Revolution, our Author himself tells us, *he could not find what hurt or prejudice 'twould have prov'd to the Church, tho' he had often consider'd the matter.* Which passage is in the *Latin* edition, tho' for the moderation of it, I suppose, 'tis left out in the *English*.

But let us proceed with our Author: *Dr.* Hooper, *a very learned and pious man, being buoy'd up by so great an authority as that of Mr.* Calvin, *when he was nominated to be Bishop of* Gloceſter, *refus'd to put on the habit, which the Canons did prescribe to be worn by those of his own order. But Archbishop* Cranmer, *and Bishop* Ridley, *positively re us'd to ordain him, unless he would conform himself to the habits, which the laws of the Church requir'd, as well as the rest of the reform'd Bishops; and this they resolutely persist in, notwithstanding a letter from the King was procur'd in his behalf.**

But how does it appear, Hooper *was buoy'd up by* Calvin's *authority in refusing the habit of his order. Calvin* himself declares the contrary. " I have receiv'd. *says he*, " the sad news, that *Hooper* is thrown into prison: I " was afraid of it some time ago. Now I fear, lest the " Bishops, coming off with the victory, should grow the " more insolent: wherefore, as I commend his constancy " in refusing Unction, so I had rather he had not so " earnestly contended about the Cap and the Linnen Gar- " ment, (tho' I don't like these things my self) and so " I lately advis'd him." †

I desire the reader farther to remark, from the Doctor's own words, that the habits have, from the very infancy of our Reformation, been an offence to *very learned and pious men.* How then can they excuse themselves in imposing them? If the fault lay in them, that their consciences were weak; yet while they thus *sin against their Brethren, and wound their weak consciences, do they not sin against Christ?* ‖

And Dr. Hooper, *being as stiff on his side, was for some time imprison'd for his obstinacy. And tho' Mr.* Calvin *wrote*

* Life of Calvin, *p.* 16. † Letter to Bulling, *p.* 60. ‖ 1 Cor. viii. 12.

wrote preſſingly to the Protector on his behalf, he could not obtain his liberty, before he promis'd to be hereafter more conformable to the eccleſiaſtical laws. * And thus, by the Popiſh argument of perſecution, was eſtabliſh'd the Church's tyranny over the conſciences of men: beſides *Hooper* teſtified, he refus'd not the habit out of *obſtinacy*, but merely becauſe he judg'd it unlawful.

However a compliance was made ſo far, in honour of ſo very deſerving a man, that he ſhould wear the Epiſcopal habit only when he officiated in the Church, at other times making uſe of ordinary apparel. Indeed ſome perſons will be apt to think that this dealing with Hooper *was too ſevere*, &c.

How that matter was adjuſted, and with what bitterneſs the Biſhops perſecuted that good Man, is related by *Fox* in his *Latin Book of Martyrs*. The paſſage I ſhall tranſlate, becauſe *Fox*, out of his too great tenderneſs towards that party, has left it out of all the *Engliſh* editions. "Thus, *ſays he*, ended this Theological quarrel "in the victory of the Biſhops, *Hooper* being forc'd to "recant; or, to ſay the leaſt, being conſtrain'd to ap- "pear once in public, attir'd after the manner of the "other Biſhops. Which, unleſs he had done, there are "thoſe who think the Biſhops would have endeavour'd "to take away his life: for his Servant told me, the "Duke of *Suffolk* ſent ſuch word to *Hooper*, who was "not himſelf ignorant what they were doing." † Horrid barbarity! Who ever was thrown into priſon before, or endanger'd his life, becauſe he refus'd a Biſhoprick? The Biſhops may perhaps be excus'd in ſome meaſure, that they would not conſecrate *Hooper* contrary to law; but there can be no kind of excuſe for their impriſoning him, and conſpiring to take away his life. Why ſhould not they have yielded to *Hooper*'s deſire of being excus'd from accepting the Biſhoprick? Was there any law to conſtrain a man to be a Biſhop, whether he would or no? Mr. *Hickman* did not, I think, without good ground imagine, there was another reaſon for the Biſhop's ſtiffneſs, and particularly for *Ridley*'s who was moſt rigid. For if *Ridley* made conſcience of not ordaining *Hooper*, but in the preſcrib'd habits; why ſhould he not have made

* Life of Calvin, *p.* 17. † *p.* 280.

made as much conſcience upon other occaſions? Why did he ordain *Bradford*, and, I think, ſome others, without the habits of their order? 'Tis not improbable, that *Ridley*, tho' a good man, and a pious Martyr, might be a little envious at *Hooper*, for his being ſo very popular as he was, and might think, by forcing him to yield, he ſhould cool the affections of the people to him; as Biſhop *Burnet* tells us his yielding had that effect. * And notwithſtanding what our Author may ſay to the contrary, that ſeverity of the Biſhops was very diſpleaſing to all good men, both abroad and at home. Nay *Ridley*, when at length he himſelf was caſt into priſon, repented of what he had done, as appears by his friendly letter to *Hooper*: and indeed he ſeems toward his latter end to have alter'd his opinion of theſe garments. For when *Brooks*, the Popiſh Biſhop of *Gloceſter* in Queen *Mary*'s time, came to degrade him, he refus'd to put on the Surplice; and while they were putting it on him, whether he would or no, "he vehemently inveighed againſt the "Romiſh Biſhop and all that *fooliſh apparel*, calling him "Antichriſt, and *the apparel fooliſh and abominable, and* "*too fond for a Vice in a play.*" † 'Tis to be obſerv'd, that among the moſt eminent of our Martyrs, *Cranmer* and *Ridley*, who had the greateſt hand in this affair, fell the moſt grievouſly in the hour of temptation. *Cranmer*'s Recantation is known to every body. And Biſhop *Ridley*, when he was at firſt put into the Tower, went to Maſs there of his own accord; but being better adviſ'd by *Bradford*, abſtain'd afterwards. And if I might be allow'd to imitate Dr. *Nichols* in his reflection upon *Brown*, ‖ I might ſay, that God perhaps deſign'd in theſe two perſons to give us warning, what a dangerous thing 'tis to have fellowſhip with idolators, either in their ceremonies, or their tyranny.

However by this timely ſeverity thus much was effected, that the Church government, which then began to ſtand more looſely, was hereby more firmly ſettled; no one afterwards, throughout the whole reign of King Edward, *daring to violate the authority of eccleſiaſtical laws.* So that Church government *ſtands* in a very *looſe* and tottering condition in *England*, if any one preſumes to omit a ſingle ceremony. But ſince ſuch

* Hiſt. Reform. *part* III. *p.* 204. † Fox, *Vol.* III. *p.* 500. ‖ *p.* 57.

ſuch trifling impertinences are the chief things about which their Church government is concern'd, who can wonder at its being ſo eagerly defended?

The reader will be deceiv'd, if he concludes from the Doctor's words, that *Hooper* was the only man, who in King *Edward*'s days refus'd the habits. *John Rogers*, a moſt excellent Man, and the firſt Martyr in Queen *Mary*'s Days, is join'd with him by *Fuller*, who ſpeaks of him and *Hooper*, as heads of the party. Dr. *Heylyn* alſo teſtifies, that he refus'd the habits. * Nay, he poſitively refus'd to wear the habits, unleſs the Popiſh Prieſts were injoin'd to wear upon their ſleeves a Chalice with an Hoſt. The ſame he aſſerts concerning *Philpot*, a very eminent Martyr; and concerning one *Tyms*, a Deacon, who was likewiſe martyr'd in Queen *Mary*'s Reign. Biſhop *Latimer* derided the garments; for when they pull'd off his Surplice at his degradation: *Now*, ſays he, *I can make no more Holy Water.* † In the Articles againſt Biſhop *Farrar* in King *Edward*'s Reign, 'twas objected, *Art.* 49. "He has made a vow that he would never "wear a Cap; for he ſaith, 'tis comely wearing of a "Hat, and ſo he cometh in his long gown and hat into "the Cathedral Church, and to the beſt towns of his "Dioceſs, ſitting in that ſort in the King's great ſeſſions "and in his Conſiſtory, making himſelf a mock to the "people." ‖ Nor does he deny it, but ſays, "That "when he goes abroad in winter, he wears a Hat to "beat off rain and ſnow; and in ſummer to ſhadow "him from the ſun, without any vow of ſuperſtition or "offence to the People. ‡" That Dr. *Taylor*, the Martyr, was no friend to the habits appears at his degradation. When the Popiſh veſtments were put upon him, "he ſtrutted about with his hands by his ſides, ſaying, "How ſay you, my Lord, am I not a *goodly fool?* "How ſay you, my maſters, if I were in *Cheap*, ſhould "I not have boys enough to laugh at theſe *apiſh toys and* "*toying trumpery?*" * And when the Surplice was pull'd off: Now, *ſays he*, I am rid of a *fool's coat.* And at another time, when ſome one had ſent him a round cap: I thank you, *ſays he*, for my Cap; I am ſomewhat proud

* Hiſtor. Reform. *part* I. *p.* 93. † Abridgment of Lincolnſhire Miniſters Book, *p.* 28. ‖ Fox, *vol.* III. *p.* 204. ‡ *p.* 208. * Fox, *p.* 174.

proud of it, for 'tis one ſtep from the Clergy in theſe days. That *Bradford* was againſt theſe habits I had occaſion to mention before. And not only did *Ridley* ſeem to have chang'd his mind about them, but *Cranmer* too; for when they were pulling off their trumpery at his degradation, he ſaid to them: *All this needeth not; I had my ſelf done with this geare long ago.** The Profeſſors of our two famous Univerſities, *Martyr* and *Bucer*, were both of them againſt the habits. Dr. *Heylyn* reflects upon *Martyr* for being offended at them, and never wearing them.† And the ſame is confirm'd by *Martyr*'s own words: "When I was at *Oxford*, *ſays he*, I would never uſe "thoſe white garments in the Choir, no, tho' I was a "Canon of the Church; I was ſatisfied in my own rea-"ſons for what I did." And in the ſame Letter he calls thoſe holy garments, *mere relicks of Popery*. And that *Bucer* was diſpleas'd with ſeveral things in the *Engliſh* Liturgy, is atteſted by Dr. *Heylyn*, and by *Beza*. This latter, in his anſwer to *Baldwin*, ſpeaking of *Bucer*, ſays: "It cannot be expreſs'd, how bitterly he bewail'd it, that "when the Goſpel began to be ſpread in *England*, a "greater regard was not had to diſcipline and purity of "rites in conſtituting thoſe Churches."‖ And being ask'd, why he did not wear *a ſquare Cap*; he anſwer'd, *Becauſe his head was not ſquare*. I might farther alledge many other Confeſſors, who fled abroad in Queen *Mary*'s days for the ſake of their religion, and were of the ſame opinion about theſe things: but becauſe it may be objected, that they carried not this opinion with them, but took it up firſt abroad, I ſhall chuſe rather to refer them to the following times.

I cannot willingly leave this reign, without taking notice of two ſad inſtances of perſecution, which is the great wickedneſs I deſign all along in this Hiſtorical Part to expoſe: they are both to be met with in *Fox*'s *Latin Book of Martyrs*; but are left out in his *Engliſh*, out of a tender regard, I ſuppoſe, to the reputation of the Martyrs.

In King *Edward*'s reign ſome were put to death for hereſy; among the reſt, one *Joan Bocher*, or *Joan* of *Kent*. Mr. *Strype* tells us, her hereſy was, that "She

* Fox, *p.* 665. † Hiſtor. Reform. *p.* 65. ‖ Park. Life, *App. p.* 41.

" believ'd that the word was made flesh in the Virgin's " belly, but not that he took flesh of the Virgin." * Now, says Mr. *Fox:* " When the Protestant Bishops had " resolv'd to put her to death, a friend of Mr. *John* " *Rogers*, the Divinity Reader in *Paul's* Church, came " to him; earnestly desiring him to use his interest with " the Archbishop, that the poor woman's life might be " spar'd, and other means us'd to prevent the spreading " of her opinion, which might be done in time; urging " tho', that the while she liv'd, she infected few with her " opinion, yet she might bring many to think well of it " by suffering death for it: he pleaded therefore, that " 'twas better she should be kept in some prison, without " an opportunity of propagating her notion among weak " people; and so she would do no harm to others, and " might live to repent herself. *Rogers*, on the other " hand, pleaded, she ought to be put to death. Well " then, says his friend, if you are resolv'd to put an end " to her life, together with her opinion, chuse some " other kind of death more agreeable to the gentleness " and mercy prescrib'd in the Gospel, there being no need " that such tormenting deaths should be taken up in imi- " tation of the Papists. *Rogers* answer'd, that burning " alive was no cruel death, but easy enough. His friend " then hearing these words, which express'd so little re- " gard to poor creatures sufferings, answer'd him with " great vehemence, and striking *Roger's* hand, which " he before held fast, said to him; Well, it may perhaps " so happen, that you your selves shall have your hands " full of that mild burning. And so it came to pass, and " *Rogers* was the first man who was burnt in Queen " *Mary's* time.

This *Rogers* was a Nonconformist, and a very excellent man, and dy'd nobly in the cause of Christ, but this barbarity of his deserves to be expos'd: and the rather, because God in his providence seems to have shewn his great displeasure against it. I am apt to think *Roger's* friend was no other than *Fox* himself.

As to the other instance, Mr. *Strype* tells us, that in the year 1552, " *Sept.* 27. a Letter was sent from the " Council to the Archbishop, to examine a sect newly " sprung

* Cranmer's Life, p. 181.

" ſprung up in *Kent.*" * He ſays it appears not what this ſect was; he ſuppoſes they might be the Family of Love, or *David George*'s ſect. But theſe conjectures of his have no good foundation: I am perſuaded, this ſect was no other than ſome good honeſt Diſſenters, who being griev'd to ſee ſo much of Popery ſtill retain'd, attempted a farther reformation themſelves, which would be a very diſpleaſing thing to our Biſhops, who expected all men ſhould wait their leiſure. Now this I ground upon a ſtory, which Mr. *Fox* immediately ſubjoyns to what I juſt now mention'd from him.

" Much ſuch another inſtance is reported concerning " one *Humphry Middleton* (who was afterwards burnt " in Queen *Mary*'s days) that when he, with ſome " others, had been kept priſoners in the laſt year of King " *Edward* by the Archbiſhop, and had been dreadfully " teaz'd by him, and the reſt in commiſſion with him, " and were now juſt upon being condemn'd, in open " court, he ſaid to him: *Well, reverend Sir, paſs what ſentence you think fit upon us; but that you may not ſay you was not forewarn'd, I teſtify that your own turn will be next.* And accordingly it came to paſs; for a little while after King *Edward* died; upon which they were ſet at liberty, and the Biſhops caſt into priſon." This *Middleton* was afterwards, in Queen *Mary*'s reign, burnt at *Canterbury*; ſo that the commiſſion, Mr. *Strype* mentions, agrees in time and place and all circumſtances to this ſtory. And this may the more confirm what I have before related from *Fox*; that the Biſhops would have attempted to take away *Hooper*'s life, if he had not conform'd to their humour.

Our Author next comes to the Hiſtory of the Troubles at *Frankfort*, which I ſhall a little more fully relate, that the temper of the Gentlemen of the Hierarchy may the better appear in a true light. MDLV.

When the moſt grievous perſecution rag'd here in *England*, in the reign of Queen *Mary*, againſt the Proteſtants, many of them ſav'd themſelves by flying abroad; and coming into various Proteſtant countries, they were every where kindly receiv'd of their Brethren; but in no place were they more happily ſettled, than at *Frankfort*: the

* Cranmer's Life, *p.* 291.

Senate gave them a Church, but upon condition they ſhould not vary from the *French* Church, either in rites, or in doctrine, that ſo no offence might be taken. Hereupon, according to the conditions of the grant, they drew up a new Liturgy more agreeable to thoſe of the Foreign Churches, leaving out all the trifling ceremonies that were in that of *England*. They choſe Mr. *John Knox* for their Paſtor, who was an eminent Divine, had been Chaplain to King *Edward*, and in good eſteem in the court for his gift of preaching, and was ſent into the North as the King's Preacher, to ſpread the Goſpel among them. He had refus'd to accept of a Biſhoprick offer'd him, and Biſhop *Ridley* could not but commend him as a man of much good learning, at the ſame time he was blaming him for finding ſo much fault, as he did, at *Frankfort* with the *Engliſh* Liturgy.* The *Engliſh* Congregation, being thus ſettled with a Paſtor and a Liturgy, liv'd very quietly and happily, inviting their Brethren to come and partake of their happineſs. But Dr. *Richard Cox*, who fled with ſome others out of *England*, ſoon broke in upon their happy ſettlement: for quickly after he came to *Frankfort*, he wickedly overthrew all the good order they had ſettled among them. Not content with the kind entertainment he met with, as a gueſt, and a Brother, come to ſojourn with him, he ſet up himſelf to rule them in an arbitrary and tyrannical manner: inſiſting upon it, that their whole ſervice muſt be order'd according to the *Engliſh* Liturgy. One, if not the chief, reaſon of his ſo great fondneſs for it was, that he had himſelf had a hand in compoſing it. But when the man's intereſt was ſmall, and he deſpair'd of carrying his point by the votes of the Congregation, becauſe his propoſal was diſagreeable to the greater part of them, as well as contrary to the conditions upon which the magiſtrates had granted them a Church; he attempted the compaſſing his deſigns by the baſeſt fraud and treachery: and firſt he and his faction anſwer'd aloud after the Miniſter, contrary to the Church's determination. 'Tis to be obſerv'd, that, whereas in the *Engliſh* Liturgy the Miniſter and the people divide the Prayers between them, the one ſaying one part, and the other the other; the *Engliſh* exiles had laid aſide this

* Strype's Life of Grindal, *p.* 19, 20.

this usage in their Liturgy in conformity to the *French* Church, wherein the Ministers voice only is heard in uttering the Prayers. When Dr. *Cox* was admonish'd of this by the Elders of the Congregation, he with the rest that came with him, made answer, That they would do as they had done in *England*, and that they would have the face of an *English* Church. All this was done by him, before he was allow'd a vote in any of the affairs of the Church. The Sunday following, one of his company got up suddenly into the pulpit, read the Litany, and Dr. *Cox* and his company answer'd aloud. *Knox*, as became a faithful Pastor, severely reprov'd these disorders in his sermon in the afternoon.

After much contention the Senate of *Frankfort* interpos'd their authority, and Mr. *John Glauberg*, by whose favour and assistance especially the *English* exiles had obtain'd such privileges, declar'd he would shut up the Church, unless the Reform'd order of the Congregation was observ'd. Dr. *Cox*, being thus disappointed, has recourse to another sort of treachery; and joining with the accuser of the brethren, charg'd Mr. *Knox* with high treason againg the Emperour. The ground of this charge was, that Mr. *Knox* preaching a sermon (afterwards printed) in *England*, when he was no way subject to the Emperour, should say of him, That he was *no less an enemy to Christ, than ever was* Nero: which was most undoubtedly true; nor would any Reform'd Divine have scrupled to assert the same. *Peter Martyr* did not stick to call him *severissimam Dei virgam, God's most severe rod.** However, by this villanous treachery Dr. *Cox* gain'd his point; for *Frankfort*, being an Imperial City, could not safely harbour a person so obnoxious to the Emperour. The Senate therefore, tho' they abhorr'd the base treachery of the accusers, yet were forc'd to order Mr. *Knox* to leave their city; and so *Cox*'s faction got the whole power into their own hands: and these new tenants, having taken full possession, turn'd their old landlords out to range about in the wide world to find new quarters. Then did the *Coxian* faction triumph in accomplishing their purposes by their crafty, but perfidious and wicked counsels: then did they insult their Brethren, over-

* Stryp. Life of Cranm. App. p. 155.

come by such arts, and now oppress'd with a second persecution. But *the triumphing of the wicked is short.* For having now got all in their own hands, and there being none left to oppose them in their impertinences, they (as 'tis the way of that furious kind of men) fell a quarrelling with one another in a most dreadful manner: nor could that little schismatical Assembly, that was left at *Frankfort*, ever after be at rest; but by their perpetual quarrellings and contentions, made themselves ridiculous to all men, both Protestants and Papists.

And thus I have given a short, but fair account of these *troubles*, upon which I shall crave leave to make a few *remarks*.

1. The temper of this Dr. *Cox*, the ringleader of the faction at *Frankfort*, deserves to be taken notice of. That he was sufficiently superstitious, we may learn from a Letter of *Cassander*'s to him. Dr. *Cox*, being made Bishop of *Ely* in the reign of Queen *Elizabeth*, had written to *Cassander*: the Letter is indeed lost; but however by *Cassander*'s answer it appears, that one design of his letter was to beg his advise, in what form, especially they should erect Crosses.* That *Cox* was like enough to write in such a manner to *Cassander*, appears to me from what is said of him in a Letter of Bishop *Jewel*'s to *Peter Martyr*, wherein he writes thus: "The controversy about Crosses is now "grown very warm. You would hardly believe how mad "some, who seem'd wise men, are in a foolish matter. "Of this sort are none of your acquaintance but *Cox*. To "morrow a disputation is to be held upon it. Some Mem"bers of Parliament are chosen to be arbitrators. The "disputants on that side are the Archbishop of *Canterbury* "and *Cox*; on the other side *Grindal* Bishop of *London*, "and myself. The event lies at the mercy of our arbi"trators. However I can't but laugh, when I consider "with what solid and weighty arguments they will defend "their brave Cross. I will hereafter give you a full ac"count, let it go which way it will: for at present 'tis "depending; yet as far as I can guess, I shall never more "write to you as a Bishop. For 'tis come to that pass, "that the silver and tin Crosses, which we had every "where broke down, must be set up again, or we must "leave our Bishopricks." † Whether *Cox* was *so pious a Divine*

* *See* Cassander's 20th Epist. *p.* 1110 *of his Works.* Nich. *p.* 8. † Collect. of Rec. *at the end of Bishop* Burnet's Hist. of the Reform, *part* III. *p.* 294.

Divine as Dr. *Nichols* repreſents him, is doubted by Dr. *Fuller*, a writer of his own ſide, who uſes theſe words concerning him: "I am ſorry ſo much is charg'd on his "memory, and ſo little can be ſaid in his vindication; and "would willingly impute it, not to his want of innocence, "but ours of intelligence. It moves me much his accu- "ſation of covetouſneſs, * dilapidating (or rather delig- "nating his Biſhoprick, cutting down the woods thereof) "for which he fell into the Queen's diſpleaſure. But I am "more offended at his taking (if true) the many Mſs. "from *Oxford*, under the pretence of a Viſitation:" † That was in the third year of the reign of King *Edward* VI. when Dr. *Cox* was Chancellor of the Univerſity, as Sir *John Harrington*, from whom *Fuller* has it, relates this matter. ‖

I muſt confeſs, ſince I wrote what I have now ſet down from others concerning Dr. *Cox*, I am ſomewhat more at a loſs for his character than before; and I am apt to think he was a man of very little ſteddineſs. For during *Hooper*'s troubles, he ſeem'd to be much for moderation, and when *Bullinger* ſent to him in *Hooper*'s behalf, he writes thus in his anſwer: "I think all things in the Church ought to "be pure and ſimple, remov'd at the greateſt diſtance from "the pomps and elements of this world. But, in this our "Church, what can I do, in ſo low a ſtation? I can only "endeavour to perſuade our Biſhops, to be of the ſame "mind with my ſelf. This I wiſh truly, and I commit "to God the care and conduct of his own work." ‡ But no ſooner was he got to *Frankfort*, but he appear'd quite another man, as we have ſeen before. And however fond he was of Croſſes, when he wrote to *Caſſander*; yet afterwards he was unwilling to officiate in the Queen's Chapel, becauſe of the ſuperſtition retain'd in it: and therefore wrote a Letter to her, in the beginning of which he uſes this expreſſion: "I moſt humbly ſue unto your godly "zeal, proſtrate, and with wet eyes, that ye will vouch- "ſafe to peruſe the conſiderations, which move, that I "dare not miniſter in your Grace's Chapel, the Lights and "Croſs remaining." And he argues earneſtly againſt them.

* *Said to feed his ſervants with powder'd veniſon (ſhrewdly hurt) to ſave other meats. Sir* J. Harrington *in his* Additions to B. G. † Church Hiſtory, *Book* 2. *p.* 111. ‖ *See* Fuller. *B.* 7. *p.* 393. ‡ Burnet's Hiſt. of the Reform. *pt.* III. *p.* 202.

2. My next remark is: That whatever the *Coxian* faction did, they did contrary to all manner of right and equity. What reason could be given, why the *English* exiles might not order their own worship, according as they thought fit? They were not then under the obligation of any laws of *England*, as Mr. *Calvin* well remarks in his Letter to them. "If the true religion, *says he*, had still "continued in *England*, there would be some occasion "to mend some things, and quite abolish many others. "But now when these beginnings of Reformation are "quite overthrown, and you are to set up a Church in "another country, and are intirely at your liberty to "chuse that form, which appears to be most for the edifi-"cation of the Church; I can't imagine what those men "mean, who are so delighted with the relicks of Popish "dregs." And truly I can't see how it can be pretended, that the *English*, who were now abroad in a foreign country, should be look'd upon as under obligation to obey the laws of *England*. Besides, those *English* laws themselves, which enjoin'd the use of the Liturgy, were now repeal'd by Queen *Mary* and her Parliament. And our Churchmen have no manner of regard to the Acts pass'd in King *Edward*'s time, if they were repeal'd in Queen *Mary*'s, unless they were reviv'd by the Acts of Parliament pass'd in some following reigns; as appears from the late controversy they have had among themselves, about the rights of Convocations.

3. Who can wonder that no method of ending our unhappy controversies could hitherto be found out, when he observes by what a fierce and turbulent spirit our Adversaries are acted? These men, when in a state of exile, struggling with want and many miseries, and groaning under the rod of the Almighty, could not command their own temper; but first of all persecute their Brethren, who differ'd from them, and drive them from their settlement. And when they had lost the opportunity of teazing and harrassing them, lest they should seem to have chang'd their temper, they fall a scolding and fighting miserably with one another. And in this noble temper they hold on, for ought I see, to this very day. So that our present Archbishop frankly says: "I am fully perswaded, that "nothing at this day preserves us from ruin and desola-"tion, but that we have not power of our selves to do "the Church a mischief; and the Prince, who sees but

"too

" too much of our tempers, is too gracious to us, and has " too great a concern for the Church's good, to suffer us " to do it. *

4. I think those words of our Author deserve to be taken notice of: *Only the Church of* Frankfort *degenerated from her mother's spirit. For here they receiv'd, in lieu of the* English *Liturgy, a medly form of Prayer, made up of some of our Collects, and other Prayers out of the* Geneva *service; and which being stripp'd of all our rites and ceremonies, appear'd a very cold and flat way of worship.* † See here the insolence of a zealot! He thinks he may make a jest of every thing, which differs from the custom of the Church of *England.* So fatal is it to be carry'd away with the spirit of a party! All Prayers deserve contempt, unless they are according to the usage of the *English* Liturgy. 'Tis not easy to express, in our language, the contempt which this passage carries in it in the *Latin* edition. He will not vouchsafe to give their Book the name of a *Liturgy*, but only a *pretended Liturgy*; which he represents as an *hotch-potch* of *scraps* of *Prayers*. But if an *hotch potch*, or *medly of scraps*, deserves only the name of a *pretended Liturgy*; I can easily direct our Author, where he may find such an one, made up of an heap of short Prayers, that have more by half of Preface and Conclusion than Petition in them, and dispos'd without any tolerable order or method. And what reason could our Author have, to think the name of a Liturgy is to be reserv'd as sacred to the *English* Service Book? But that Liturgy of *Frankfort, being stripp'd of all our rites and ceremonies, appear'd*, as our Author says, *a very cold and flat way of worship.* To you all, Gentlemen, whom he has appointed Judges between us, to you, I say, I appeal: Whether a Liturgy, which retains all rites and ceremonies of a divine institution, and rejects only those of human device, *appears* to you *a very cold and flat way of worship?* What an intolerable fondness for ceremonies do these men discover! One would think the old Pharisees were risen again from the dead. How could our Author pretend to prove this? Surely he thought he had to do with very easy Judges, who would take this, without any proof, upon his bare word, and thereupon condemn their own Liturgies, that they might pass the greater complement

* Appeal, *p.* 121, † P. 19.

plement upon his. However 'tis our comfort, that none but Papists and bigotted Churchmen, will talk after this rate. I cannot here but observe, how very differently this Author talks from one of their antient Bishops, I mean Bishop *Grindal*, who when he was proceeding against some Dissenters for using that *service*, and one of them told him, if he would *reprove that Book by the word of God they would leave it and give over*; honestly answer'd, *We cannot reprove it.* * But if rites and ceremonies are of so great use in a Liturgy, why dont you improve your Liturgy by a larger store of them? Surely the Papists have much more reason to twit you with a *cold and flat way of worship*, for laying aside so many ceremonies, than you can have to reproach the *English* exiles in that manner, because they rejected some few. And there are many in the Church, who seem to agree with the Papists herein, while they profess an earnest desire of having a far greater number establish'd. How unreasonable was it for our Author to express such a resentment of *Calvin's* comparatively mild censure of the *English* Liturgy; since he himself, upon all occasions, treats the Liturgies of Foreigners with great scurrility and abusiveness?

5. I would further animadvert upon what our Author says, concerning the government of these exiles: *For the government of the Church, instead of the antient Episcopacy, they set up Mr.* Calvin's *new way of Presbyters and Lay Elders.* † This he is pleas'd, in his *Latin* edition, to call *a certain monster of government.* Now I would fain know, What was the difference between the form of government fix'd upon by these exiles, and that which the *Coxian* faction settled in their Church at *Frankfort?* When they had perfidiously driven away Mr. *Knox*, whom did they appoint Bishop of their schismatical Assembly? I should be glad to hear his name, that we might know what a man he was, and be satisfied that one *monster* did not come in the room of another.

MDLVIII. Queen *Mary* being dead, was succeeded by Queen *Elizabeth*, in whose reign religion was again reform'd. All good men conceiv'd great hopes, the Reformation in doctrine and worship would now very speedily be brought to

* Part of a Register, *p.* 34. † *p.* 21.

to perfection; but they were deceiv'd. Three things seem to have concur'd in disappointing their expectations.

1. The great authority which the Queen assum'd about matters of religion.

2. The too earnest desire, which then prevail'd, of pleasing the Papists.

3. The subtil and crafty tricks of the Papists. I will consider these a little in their order.

1. The great and extravagant authority Queen *Elizabeth* assum'd, in matters of religion, was one chief cause why the Reformation made no greater advances in her reign. All our Divines, who truly hated Popery, labour'd earnestly in the beginning of her reign, that the Reformation begun in King *Edward*'s time, might now be carry'd on much farther. But the Queen was of another mind; and she manag'd all things as she pleas'd. But 'twill give least offence if I use here Churchmens words, rather than my own.

Mr. *George Cranmer*, in his Letter to Mr. *Hooker*, says: "It may be remembred, that at first the greatest part of "the learned in the land were either eagerly affected, or "favourably inclin'd that way [*of the Nonconformists.*] "The books then written, for the most part, savour'd of "the disciplinary stile: it sounded every where in pulpits, "and in common phrase of mens speech: the contrary "part began to fear they had taken a wrong course.*

Bishop *Burnet* likewise tells us: "It appears by the "Letters of the Bishops to *Bullinger*, that they preserv'd "the antient habits rather in compliance with the Queen's "inclinations, than out of any liking they had to them: "so far were they from liking them, that they plainly ex- "press'd their dislike of them. *Jewel*, in a Letter bear- "ing date the 8th of *February*, 1566. wishes, *That the* "*vestments, together with all the other remnants of Popery,* "*might be thrown both out of their Churches, and out of* "*the minds of the people*; and laments the Queen's fixed- "ness to them, so that she would suffer no change to be "made. And in *January* of the same year, *Sands* writes "to the same purpose: *Disputes are now on foot concerning* "*the Popish vestments, whether they should be us'd or not*; "*but God will put an end to these things. Horn*, Bishop of

* *Prefix'd to the* Ecclesiast. Polity.

" of *Winchester*, went farther. For in a *Letter* dated the " 16th of *July*, 1565. he writes of the Act concerning " the Habits with great regret, and expresses some hopes " that it might be repeal'd next Session of Parliament, if " the Popish party did not hinder it; and he seems to " stand in doubt, whether he himself should conform to " it or not; upon which he asks *Bullinger*'s advice. And " in many letters writ on that subject, 'tis asserted, that " both *Cranmer* and *Ridley* intended to procure an Act " for abolishing the Habits; and that they only defended " their lawfulness, but not their fitness; and therefore " they blam'd private persons that refus'd to obey the " laws. *Grindal*, in a Letter dated the 27th of *August*, " 1566, writes, That all the Bishops, who had been be- " yond Sea, had, at their return, dealt with the Queen " to let the matter of the habits fall: but she was so pre- " possess'd, that, though they had all endeavour'd to di- " vert her from prosecuting that matter, she continued " still inflexible. This had made them submit to the " laws, and to wait for a fit opportunity to reverse them.— " *Cox*, Bishop of *Ely*, in one of his Letters, laments the " aversion they found in the Parliament, to all the propo- " sitions that were made for the reformation of abuses. *

To this I may add other passages. *Sands*, in a Letter to Archbishop *Parker*, shews that he esteem'd the habits a yoke. " How the folks go, *says he*, I cannot well tell; but " I assure you mine go so soberly and decently, as they " offend no piece of the Queen's injunctions. For if I be " under the yoke, such as pertain to me shall draw in " the same yoke with me." † And *Pilkinton* wrote earnestly against the imposing them. He urg'd, that it should be consider'd, " How all Reformed countries had " cast away Popish apparel with the Pope, and that we " contend to keep it as a holy relick: that many Ministers " would rather leave their livings, than be like to Popish " Teachers of such superstitions: and the realm had a great " scarcity of Teachers, and many places were left destitute of " any: that it would give incurable offence to the favourers " of God's truth in other countries: that St. *Paul* bid men " use such apparel as became those that profess'd godliness: " but if we forsake Popery, as wicked, how shall we say " their

* Letters concerning his Trav. *Let. I. p.* 42. † Strype's Life of Park. *App. p.* 26.

" their apparel becomes Saints and professors of the Gos-
" pel?" * And when *Harding* had derided the Ministers, who refus'd the apparel, Bishop *Jewel* defends them: " They
" say not, *says he*, that the apparel is holy or unholy:
" but they may truly say, the same apparel of your part
" hath been foully abus'd to filthy purposes: they may
" justly say, they would not gladly in any appearance
" shew themselves like to them, who have so untruly,
" and so long deceiv'd the world. And herein they are
" not without sundry authorities and examples of godly
" Fathers." † And accordingly he produces several himself in favour of their opinion. And when some matters, injoin'd by the Common Prayer Book, were charg'd upon the Bishops by *Bullinger*, and some other learned Foreigners of the Reformation, they reply'd in their Letters: " That none of them were of the Par-
" liament House at the passing of the Book: and that
" they had therefore no voice in making of the law.
" But that after it was pass'd, they, being chosen to be
" Bishops, must either content themselves to take their
" places, as things were, or else leave them to Papists and
" Lutherans: but in the mean space they promised not
" to urge their Brethren in these things; and when op-
" portunity should serve, to seek reformation of them." ‖ But they soon forgot their promise; for in the year 1564, several of them were concern'd in drawing up the *Advertisements*; the design of which was to trouble Ministers for these things: and tho' they met with much opposition herein, they at last got them, upon much importunity, authoriz'd by the Queen. ‖

Hence our Adversaries may understand, of whom we have learn'd to call their ceremonies, *remnants of Popery*. And hence our Brethren abroad may perceive, how much the times are alter'd with us. Our first Reformers never ascrib'd any holiness or virtue to them; nor were they so fond of them as to think, with our Author, religion would be *a poor and lean* thing without them. I could add many other Divines to those mention'd by Bishop *Burnet*, who were very much of the same opinion; such as *Whitehead*, who is said to have refus'd the Archbishop-
rick

---

* Parker's Life, *p.* 155. † Def. of the Apolog. *f.* 325. ‖ Life of Parker, *p.* 154. ‡ *Idem*, *p.* 159, 159, 160.

rick of *Canterbury*; *Coverdale*, who would not accept *Oxford*, or any other Biſhoprick, becauſe he diſlik'd the habits; *Alexander Nowel*, Dean of *Paul's*; "who be- "ing one of the Queen's Chaplains, and ſpeaking leſs "reverently, in a Sermon preach'd before her, of the "ſign of the Croſs, was call'd to aloud by her, out of "her cloſet window, and commanded to retire from that "ungodly digreſſion, and return to his text." * Our Churchmen therefore have no reaſon to boaſt, their ceremonies were appointed by the moſt pious and learned Divines, who made it their buſineſs to reduce all things to the ſtandard of Scripture and antiquity. The controverted ceremonies were eſtabliſh'd much againſt their minds, and to their great ſorrow, with a regard only to the pleaſure of her Majeſty, and not to antiquity.

Biſhop *Burnet* has given us an account how the Queen came to be ſo obſtinate in theſe matters; which I ſhall the rather ſet down, becauſe it really accounts for one great ſource of all our miſery. "The Queen had been "bred up from her infancy with hatred of the Papacy, "and a love to the Reformation; but yet as her firſt "impreſſions in her Father's reign were in favour of ſuch "old rites, as he had ſtill retain'd; ſo in her own nature "ſhe lov'd ſtate, and ſome magnificence in religion, as "well as in every thing elſe. She thought, that in her "Brother's reign, they had grip'd it too much of ex- "ternal ornaments, and had made their doctrine too nar- "row in ſome points; therefore ſhe intended to have "ſome things explain'd in more general terms, that ſo all "parties might be comprehended by them. She inclin'd "to keep up images in Churches, and to have the man- "ner of Chriſt's preſence in the Sacrament left in ſome "general words, that thoſe who believ'd the corporal "Preſence might not be driven away from the Church "by too nice an explanation of it; nor did ſhe like the "title of *Supreme Head*, ſhe thought it imported too "great a power, and came too near that authority, which "Chriſt only had over the Church. Theſe were her "own private thoughts. She conſider'd, nothing could "make her power great in the world abroad, ſo much as "the uniting all her people together at home. Her Father's "and

* Heyl. Hiſtor. of the Reform. *p.* 296.

" and her Brother's reign had been much distracted by the " rebellions within *England*; and she had before her eyes " the instance of the coldness that the people had ex- " press'd to her Sister on all occasions, for the maintain- " ing or recovering the dominions beyond sea; therefore " she was very desirous to find such a temper, in which " all might agree. She observ'd that in the changes for- " merly made, particularly in renouncing the Papacy, " and making some alterations in worship, the whole " Clergy had concurr'd, and so she resolv'd to follow " and imitate these by easy steps.*

The more I consider her character, the more I wonder she befriended the Reformation so far as she did: for tho' she was a very wise and politic Queen, and acted with the greatest judgment imaginable for the good of her subjects in all state matters; yet she had but a very moderate share of religion. Dr. *Heylyn* tell us, that in her Sister's time, " 'Tis certain she resorted to Mass, and seem'd " not a little discontented, that she could not gain so " much upon the Queen by her outward conformity, as " to belive that she was catholicly affected." † And Mr. *Strype* has inform'd us, that she declar'd to Archbishop *Parker*, that had it not been for a clause in the *Act of Uniformity*, which reserves to her a power " To " ordain and publish such farther rites and ceremonies, " as should be most for the reverence of Christ's holy " mysteries and sacraments, she would not have agreed to " divers orders of the Book:" ‖ *i.e.* have pass'd the *Act of Uniformity*, or reform'd religion at all. He gives us a hint too, that she seldom us'd to hear sermons, except it was in Lent. ‡ She was so inveterately set against Priests marriages, that she would never suffer any Act to be made in her time for the allowing them; and all the children of Priests in her reign were bastards in the eye of the law; and the Bishops themselves were forc'd to obtain particular Acts of Parliament to legitimate their children, that they might be capable of inheriting their estates after them. * Nay, she seems to have repented, she had gone so far with the Reformation, and to have threat-

---

* Hist. Reform. *part* II. *p.* 376. † Hist. Reform. *p.* 270. ‖ Parker's Life, *p.* 309. ‡ *Idem*, *p.* 302. *See p.* 511.

threatned to have reſtored Popery, at leaſt a good degree of it. Thus *Parker* relates the matter in a Letter to Secretary *Cecyl*: "The Queen's Highneſs expreſs'd to me "a repentance, that we were thus appointed in office, "wiſhing it had been otherwiſe: which inclinations be- "ing known at large to Queen *Mary*'s Clergy, they "laugh prettily to ſee how the Clergy of our time is "handled, and what equity of laws be miniſtred to our "ſort: but by patience and ſilence we paſs over, *&c.* and "leave all to God: in the mean time we have cauſe all "to be utterly diſcomfited and diſcouraged. Her Ma- "jeſty moreover talk'd of other manner of injunctions, "that ſhall hereafter follow. I truſt God ſhall ſtay her "heart." * What apprehenſions he had of her mean- ing appears by what follows ſoon after in the Letter: "I ſhould be ſorry that the Clergy ſhould have cauſe to "ſhew diſobedience, with *oportet Deo obedire magis quam* "*hominibus, we muſt obey God rather than man.* And "what inſtillers ſo ever there be, there be enough of this "contemptible flock, that will not ſhrink to offer their "blood for the defence of Chriſt's verity, if it be openly "impugn'd, or ſecretly ſuggill'd." And certainly ſince our *Engliſh* Reformation was ſettled according to the ſovereign will and pleaſure of a Queen, who had ſo little of religion or a true and hearty Proteſtant in her, we need not be ſurpriz'd, that it ſhould be ſo very imperfect.

2. Another thing, which was a great hindrance to the progreſs of our *Engliſh* Reformation, was the great endeavour then us'd to pleaſe the Papiſts. And as ſuperſtitious people are commonly very ſtiff in their opinion, it muſt at beſt be a very imperfect Reformation which they will bear with. But our Reformation was carried on with ſuch a deſign, both in King *Edward* and Queen *Elizabeth*'s reign.

Dr. *Heylyn* tells us of the Reformation in King *Edward*'s days: "That neither to loſe time, nor preſs too "much at once upon the people, 'twas thought fit to "ſmooth the way to the intended Reformation, by ſend- "ing out ſome preparatory injunctions—All which was "done to this intent, that the people in all places, being "pre-

* Parker's Life, *App.* p. 30.

" prepar'd by little and little, might with more eaſe and " leſs oppoſition, admit the total alteration, in the face of " the Church, which was intended in due time to be in- " troduc'd. *

Who then can think we are injurious to the memory of our famous Martyrs? They, as well as we, wiſh'd for a perfect Reformation. That it could not be brought about in their time, prov'd a great trouble to them; as it has to us, and to all learned and good men in the world, if we except ſome modern Eccleſiaſtics. Dr. *Heylyn*, who was a bitter enemy to the deſign of any farther Reformation, ſpeaking of the untimely death of King *Edward*, which was ſadly regretted by all the friends of the Proteſtant religion, tells us: " That he could not " reckon it for an infelicity to the Church of *Eng-* " *land.*" †

But let us hear what he ſays of the Reformation in Queen *Elizabeth*'s time. He tells us: " That an Act paſ- " ſed for recommending and impoſing the Book of Com- " mon Prayer, and adminiſtration of Sacraments, ac- " cording to ſuch alterations and corrections as were " made therein, by thoſe who were appointed to reviſe " it. In the performance of which ſervice, there was " great care taken for expunging all ſuch paſſages in it, " as might give any ſcandal or offence to the Popiſh par- " ty. ------ By which compliances the Book was made ſo " paſſable amongſt the Papiſts, that for ten years they ge- " nerally repair'd to their pariſh Churches without doubt " or ſcruple; nay, the form and faſhion of our devotions " did ſo far ſatisfy the Pope, then being, that he ſhew'd " himſelf willing to confirm it by his Papal power: and " *Parpalio* was inſtructed to offer, in the name of his Ho- " lineſs, that the *Engliſh* Liturgy ſhould be confirm'd." ‖ He informs us, that ſeveral things, which King *Edward* had aboliſh'd, were retain'd by this Queen, as they had been in her Father's time; and that, " For this ſhe re- " ceiv'd both thanks and honour from her very ene- " mies." And he particularly mentions Dr. *Harding* as one of thoſe enemies, who treated her in that manner. But our Adverſaries, with Dr. *Heylyn*'s good leave, have no great reaſon to triumph in the commendations and

* Hiſt. of Reform. *p.* 34. † Ibid. *Pref.* ‖ Ibid. *p.* 283.

applauſes of the Papiſts, who uſe rather to inſult and deride them for theſe things. Thus *Edward Weſton*, a Popiſh writer, girds them: "Other Proteſtants, that they "may not ſeem deſperately wicked, make uſe of our "Miſſal and Breviary, culling out ſuch things as they "like beſt in them: and that their religion may appear "with ſomewhat of a better grace, they have their Ca-"nons, forſooth, and their Archdeacons; and, according "to the faſhion of the Church of *Rome*, they have Caps "and Hoods, and ſuch like attire, which they ſay they "found in the Synagogue of Antichriſt: by which it "appears the religion of Proteſtants is guilty of theft:— "or, if they don't like to be counted thieves, let them "go on to ape us and Antichriſt. Theſe men, with all "their ſtate, are a deriſion to thoſe of their own ſide, "as well as to ours."* And then he adds this ſaying of one: "The *Engliſh* drove the Pope out of the King-"dom ſo haſtily, that they forc'd him to leave his gar-"ments behind him; and now they put them on, and, "like ſo many Players acting their parts, they dance in "them in a way of triumph." And when *Bonner* was told, that our Parliament had thought fit to continue ſome of the Popiſh ſuperſtitions, he is reported to have made this anſwer: *If they ſup of our broth, they will ſoon eat of our beef.* I cannot here omit a paſſage I find in an old Pamphlet to this purpoſe: "We find, that, "ſome of the learneſt of our *Engliſh* Papiſts (namely, "*Martial*, *Briſtow*, and he that penn'd that Petition for "the Papiſts, which *D. Sutclif* and *M. Powel* have an-"ſwer'd) have by this argument juſtify'd their Church "and religion, *That we have borrow'd our ceremonies from "them.* Yea, ſome of them, as *Harding*, *Martial*, and "he that wrote the Apologetical Epiſtle for our *Engliſh* "Papiſts, have profeſs'd, that this was to them an evi-"dent argument, that Queen *Elizabeth* did in her con-"ſcience well like of their religion; becauſe ſhe liked and "maintain'd their ceremonies. And the ſuperſtitious mul-"titude do defend the bleſſing themſelves with croſſing "their breaſts and forehead, by our croſſing of children "in Baptiſm."†

3. Our

* Theatr. vit. Civil. & Sacr. † Lincoln's Abridgment, *p.* 25.

3. Our Reformation was very much cramp'd by the subtil and crafty tricks of Papists, or such pretended Protestants, as had a great influence in the managing our affairs. So I have observed before out of Bishop *Burnet*, that Bishop *Horn* hoped to have the *Act* for the *Habits* repeal'd, if the Popish Party did not hinder it. Dr. *Heylyn* and Bishop *Burnet* assure us, that Queen *Elizabeth* kept her Popish Sister's privy Council. And as to the Popish Clergy, there were few of them, who did not comply with the new Acts of Parliament in Queen *Elizabeth*'s time.

Our Author tells us: *There were not wanting several Ministers in the Church, who, for want of persons fit to be intrusted with the care of souls, after the turning out of the Popish Priests, were instituted into livings, who were fond of the* Genevian *discipline.** By which he would seem to intimate, that abundance of vacances were made in the Church, by the Papists giving up their livings. But this is not true, as will plainly appear by the following words of Bishop *Burnet*: "It was found that of 9400 beneficed "men in *England*, there were no more, but fourteen Bi-"shops, six Abbots, twelve Deans, twelve Archdeacons, "fifteen Heads of Colleges, fifty Prebendaries, and eighty "Rectors of parishes, that had left their Benefices upon "the account of Religion: so compliant where the Papists "generally. And indeed the Bishops after this time had "the same apprehension of the danger, into which reli-"gion was brought by the jugglings of the greatest part "of the Clergy, who retain'd their affections to the old "superstition, that those in King *Edward*'s time had. "So that if Queen *Elizabeth* had not liv'd so long as she "did, 'till all that generation was dead, and a new set of "men, better educated and principled, were grown up "and put in their rooms; and if a Prince of another re-"ligion had succeeded before that time; they had proba-"bly turn'd about again to the old superstitions, as nim-"bly as they had done before in Queen *Mary*'s days. "That, which supported the superstitious party in King "*Edward*'s time most, was, that many great Bishops did "secretly favour and encourage them; therefore it was "now resolv'd to look well to the filling of the vacant "Sees."†

* *p.* 27. † Hist. Reform. *Vol.* II. *p.* 401.

I would not be underſtood to deny, there was a great ſcarcity of Preachers, and perſons fit to be put into Cures at that time. 'Tis certain the Popiſh Clergy, who continued in their livings, were very unfit for them; but ſince they were allow'd by the government to keep their livings, and ſo few of them had the honeſty to quit them for the ſake of their conſciences, the want of incumbents could not be ſo great as is pretended. And indeed it muſt be an everlaſting reproach to thoſe times, that when they ſuffer'd a Clergy ſo popiſhly affected, and ſo unable, to teach the people; they ſhould yet be ſo ſevere, as they were, in vexing, perſecuting, and ſilencing honeſt and faithful Miniſters, who would moſt gladly have diſcharg'd their office with a good conſcience. What a ſad account does Biſhop *Sands* give of the ſtate of the nation, in a Sermon before the Queen! "The mo- "ther city of the realm is reaſonably furniſh'd with "faithful Preachers; certain other cities, not many in "number, are bleſſed too, tho' not in like ſort. But the "ſilly people of the land otherwhere, eſpecially in the "north parts, pine away and periſh, for want of this ſa- "ving food; they are much decayed for want of pro- "phecy. Many there are that hear not a ſermon in ſeven "years, I might ſay ſafely, in ſeventeen. Their blood "will be requir'd at ſome bodies hands." * And tho' the Biſhop ſpeaks of *London*, as tolerably ſupply'd; yet Mr. *Strype* informs us, that even there the caſe was very bad; that they were inſufferable pluraliſts, and not above one third part in the Archdeaconry of *London* Preachers. † Many of the Clergy, who had been bitter perſecutors in Queen *Mary*'s time, were continued in their livings, and perſecuted their neighbours in Queen *Elizabeth*'s reign. Now when men, ſo popiſhly affected, abounded among the Clergy, and at court, and in general among all ranks in the nation, they would not fail to uſe all their intereſt to have as much as poſſible of the old ſuperſtition retain'd. And unleſs that ſort of men had been very much afraid of the Queen; 'twould be rather a wonder the Reformation was carried ſo far, than that was not carried farther.

Thus

* Sermons, *p.* 66. † Parker's Life, *p.* 95.

Thus I have laid open to the reader the great cauſes of our miſery, and the hindrance of the *Engliſh* Reformation. I ſhall now return to the Doctor.

He is not miſtaken, in ſaying ſome of our ſide *attain'd ſome of the principal dignities* of the Church at that time. * I might here alledge, that ſeveral, who had very lately been Papiſts, were in like manner advanc'd, and ſo it could be no great wonder if Proteſtants had the ſame favour. Indeed theſe men were famous for their learning, and good ſervices in the Church; and were much in favour with the Biſhops, who, as yet, retain'd their moderation, and were unwilling to perſecute their Brethren. And that has been always the mind of the Diſſenters; that, as long as they could, with a ſafe conſcience, they were for continuing in the public Churches. But then thoſe excellent and learned men, being as deſirous of purity as peace, did not forbear to *find fault with, and condemn* ſeveral things in the conſtitution, and in their exhortations urg'd a reformation of them. Our Adverſaries cry out upon them for this; and we, on the contrary, think they acted a very prudent and honeſt part in it. If any of them ſpake of theſe matters unadviſedly, and with too much bitterneſs; we pretend not to juſtifie them, but leave them to the cenſure of our Adverſaries. And tho' I never ſaw that Treatiſe of *Gilby*'s, which our Author mentions; yet I dare engage to produce abundance of the Church writers, both antient and modern, who ſhall match him for bitterneſs, let him be as bitter as he will.

This year a Convocation was held, in which MDLXII. a vigorous attempt was made for a farther Reformation. In this Synod, *the review*, our Author mentions, *was made of the* XXXIX *Articles.* † There were ſeveral noble propoſals made, by ſome Members of both Houſes, and earneſt diſputes there were about theſe matters. At laſt, "On *February* 13, theſe following Articles were "read, to be approv'd or rejected."

"1. That all Sundays in the year, and the prrincipal "Feaſts of Chriſt, be kept Holidays; and all other Holi-"days to be abrogated.

"2. That in all pariſh Churches the Miniſter, in Com-"mon Prayer, turn his face towards the people, and there

* *p.* 22. † *p.* 23.

" distinctly read the divine service appointed, where all " people assembled may hear and be edified.

" 3. That in ministring the sacrament of Baptism, the " ceremony of making the Cross in the child's forehead " may be omitted, as tending to superstition.

" 4. Forasmuch as divers communicants are not able to " kneel during the time of the communion, for age, sickness, " and sundry other infirmities; and some also superstiti- " ously kneel and knock; that order of kneeling may be left " to the discretion of the Ordinary, within his jurisdiction.

" 5. That it be sufficient for the Minister in time of say- " ing divine service, and ministring of the sacraments, to " use a Surplice; and that no Minister say service, or mi- " nister the sacraments, but in a comely garment or habit.

" 6. That the use of Organs be remov'd." *

The sense of the 5th (the Bishop of *Sarum* thinks) is not clear, except we suppose the word, *once*, to have come after, *the Minister*; so that it was propos'd, that it should be sufficient *once* to use the Surplice. † By the complexion of the Articles one would guess, that instead of *sufficient*, were to be read *not necessary*. And then, the Surplice being abolish'd, there was good reason for the last part of the Article. Mr. *Strype* tells us, those who were against these Articles carry'd it (though with great difficulty) against those that were for them. But the Bishop has honestly given us an account how they carry'd it. I think his words deserve to be taken notice of. " There arose, *says he*, great disputes concerning these " propositions; some approving, and others rejecting " them: and it was propos'd by some, to refer the matter " to the Archbishop and Bishops. Many protested, that " they could in no manner consent to any one of them; " since they were contrary to the Book of Common Pray- " er, that was ratified by Act of Parliament: nor would " they admit of any alteration of the orders, rules, rites, " or regulations already settled by that Book. There " were public disputations between learned men, some ap- " proving, and others condemning the propositions. Thir- " teen persons were named, as the disputants. In conclu- " sion, the House was divided, and counted: forty three " voted for the propositions, and thirty five against them, " and

* Strype's Annals. *p.* 289. † Hist. Reform. *Part* III. *p.* 302.

" and that no change ſhould be made in the Book of " Common Prayer, then eſtabliſhed. But when the proxies " were counted, thoſe who were for the propoſitions " were in all fifty eight, and thoſe who were againſt them " were fifty nine. So that they were agreed to by a ma- " jority of eight, of thoſe who were preſent, and who " had heard the diſputations; yet thoſe were out voted " by a majority of one vote, by the proxy of an abſent " perſon." I muſt own, I like theſe things the worſe, for the ſake of the means by which they were continued among us. And he that can believe, the votes of nine abſent perſons, who heard nothing of the debates about a matter, are of more moment than thoſe of eight who were preſent at them; or can think that ſuch a way of proceeding is grounded upon Scripture, or any valuable antiquity, may even believe what he pleaſes.

Let me here farther mention theſe two requeſts, or Petitions of the lower Houſe of Convocation. They are among many other, and are the 3d and 4th in number.

" 3. That no private Baptiſm be miniſtred hereafter, " but only by thoſe that be Miniſters of the Church.

" 4. That in public Baptiſm, the father of the infant " (if he poſſible may) be preſent: and that he, and the " Godfathers and Godmothers, ſhall openly profeſs and " recite the Articles of the chriſtian faith, commonly " call'd *the Creed*; and deſire that the infant may in that " faith be baptiz'd, and receiv'd into the Church of " Chriſt. And they ſhall not anſwer in the infant's name, " to ſuch queſtions as hereafter have been demanded of " them in that behalf." * One part of the latter of theſe is contradicted by the Convocation of 1603, which made this wiſe Canon: " No parent ſhall be urg'd to be preſent, " nor be admitted to anſwer as Godfather for his own " child." † The other part would have made the Church's ſervice much more intelligible, and leſs liable to exception than 'tis at preſent.

Alſo the Articles were, as I ſaid, *review'd* at this Synod; and the lower Houſe had petition'd, that Miniſters might be requir'd to ſubſcribe them: ‖ yet there was no law of the land to require ſubſcription, till the year 1571, as *Fuller* aſſures us. And yet ſome of the more rigid

* Strype's Annals, *p.* 301. † Can. 29. ‖ *See* Strype's Ann *p.* 302.

Bishops insisted upon subscription, before it was commanded by Act of Parliament. Thus *Sampson* was turn'd out from being Dean of *Christ Church* in *Oxford*. And *John Fox*, the Martyrologist, was call'd to subscribe, but refus'd; and pulling out his *Greek Testament*, said; *I will subscribe this:* and when they requir'd more, he told them plainly, he would not; and that he had only a small Prebend in the Church of *Salisbury*, and if they would take that away, much good might it do them. But these persecutors themselves were asham'd to deal severely with a man of his age and piety, and who had deserv'd so well of our nation by his historical writings. Towards him therefore they exercis'd an unusal forbearance, and permitted him to enjoy his Prebend. And when afterwards the Ministers were requir'd to subscribe the Articles, some of the Bishops were so very forward and officious, as to devise other Articles of their own head, and severely persecuted such Ministers who refus'd to subscribe them. It must be own'd, that some of the Bishops at that time were more gentle and moderate; but the farther we come into Queen *Elizabeth*'s reign, the more rigid and severe we generally find them. But though I have put these things here briefly together, because our Author skips from the Convocation, to the Parliament's passing the Articles; yet it will not be amiss to take a little more notice of some particulars, before we proceed to examine what he says.

MDLXIV. It having pleas'd the Queen, to leave so many occasions of offence in the appointed service; it cannot be thought there would not be many, who would refuse to comply with the establish'd order. Abundance of Ministers us'd that liberty, which they apprehended was broke in upon by the state; and some were more vehement in their opposition than others. Queen *Elizabeth*, who seems to have been a Princess peculiarly tender of her authority, was greatly displeas'd that her commands were not more uniformly obey'd, and that Ministers appear'd in such different garbs in performing divine service. And this year she stir'd up her Bishops to persecute their Brethren. The Bishops, nay, and the Queen her self, would sometimes make heavy complaints of the scarcity of Preachers, and the mischiefs of ignorance in the people, which proceeded from thence. And yet now, when the scarcity of Preachers was greatest, means are us'd to stop their mouths. For this persecution fell almost only upon

on them. The Popiſh Clergy, who kept in at every change, and the Readers of Homilies, who were not Preachers, and knew but little of the matter, made no great difficulty of conformity. This render'd their proceedings the more inexcuſable. The perſecution began in *London*, and theſe ſix Biſhops uſually met (the four firſt of which were upon the eccleſiaſtical commiſſion) *Parker*, Archbiſhop of *Canterbury*; *Grindal*, Biſhop of *London*; *Cox*, Biſhop of *Ely*: *Gueſt*, Biſhop of *Rocheſter*; *Horn*, Biſhop of *Wincheſter*; and *Bullingham*, Biſhop of *Lincoln*. The Miniſters being convented before them, were requir'd, "To "promiſe and ſubſcribe conformity to the habits; and "likewiſe to the rites of the Common Prayer, the xxxix "Articles, and the Queen's injunctions; or to be depriv'd "within three months." * They likewiſe drew up a Book for Miniſters to ſubſcribe to; and all this at firſt, without the Queen's ratification of the Book, or any Act of Parliament to empower them to do as they did. And nothing could be more inſolent than the Lay Chancellor's uſage of the Miniſters, in the preſence of thoſe reverend Commiſſioners mention'd before. "My maſters, *ſays he*, and the "Miniſters of *London*, the Council's pleaſure is, that ſtrict-"ly ye keep the unity of apparel, like this man, pointing "to Mr. *Robert Cole* (canonically habited) as you ſee him; "that is, a ſquare Cap, a ſcholar's Gown, prieſt like, a "Tippet, and in the Church a linen Surplice: and in-"violably obſerve the Rubric of the Common Prayer, "and the Queen's Majeſty's injunctions; and the Book of "Convocation. Ye that will preſently ſubſcribe, write, "*volo*. Thoſe that will not ſubſcribe, write, *nolo*. Be "brief; make no words. And when ſome would have "ſpoken, the anſwer was, *Peace, peace*. Apparitor, call "the Churches: maſters, anſwer preſently, *ſub pœna con-"temptus*, and ſet your names." † I believe, none of our Adverſaries will be able to find any Lay Elder to match this Lay Chancellor. The conſequence of theſe proceedings was, that ſome yielded, others were ſuſpended and depriv'd; and many of them, having wives and children, labour'd under great poverty; ſome betook themſelves to ſecular occupations; ſome had favour ſhewn them, upon the requeſt of noble and honourable perſons; and ſome were

* Strype's Annals, *p.* 419. † Grindal's Life, *p.* 98.

were afterwards put into prisons. And thus the poor men, just return'd home from a state of exile, for the sake of religion, are by their merciless Brethren oppress'd with a second persecution. These Commissioners sent up for *Sampson*, Dean of *Christ-Church*; and *Humfrey*, Head of *Magdalen College* in *Oxford*; and when they persisted in their refusal to comply, they were told by the Archbishop, that *they must depart their places.* I can't but add what here follows in Mr. *Strype*: "While they thus stood out, *Horn*, "Bishop of *Winchester*, notwithstanding, presented *Humfrey* to a living in the Dioceſs of *Sarum*. But *Jewel*, "the Bishop, would not admit him, and on this occa- "sion wrote to the Archbishop a Letter about it: *That* "*in respect to his vain contention about apparel, he thought* "*best to make a stay, till he understood his Grace's pleasure:* "*and that, unless he should otherwise advise him by his Let-* "*ter, he minded not in any wise to receive him: adding, that* "*this long sufferance bred great offence.* For *Humfrey* was "conniv'd at for a good while, till at last he consented. "But *Sampson* was depriv'd this year, and succeeded by "*Thomas Goodwin*, D. D." * I can't but observe, how very different Bishop *Jewel* appear'd to be, from what he was at some other times; and indeed, the same observation may be made of *Grindal* and several others; that the longer they were in their offices, the more severe they became.

Sampson and *Humfrey* us'd all the peaceable and submissive methods they could, to prevent their being so severely dealt with. Mr. *Strype* has publish'd the submissive Letter they sent to the Bishops, who sat in commission: Wherein they "protest, before God, what a bitter grief it "was to them, that there should be a dissention between "them for so small a matter, as *woollen and linen*," [as they stiled the Cap and Surplice.] "But that it comforted "them, that it was but an agreeing discord, seeing they "all, under Christ, profess'd the same Gospel, and the "same faith; and that it was in things which were in "their own nature indifferent; that each followed their "own spirit and opinion, where there might be room for "liberty of 'em; but there ought to be charity ever.—— "If

* Annals 421.

" If there were any reckoning to be made of fellowſhip " in Chriſt, if there were any fellowfeeling and compaſſion, " of which they doubted not, they beſeech'd them to per- " mit, nay, to promote that which *Paul* commended, and " *Auguſtine* yielded; that every one might acquieſce in his " own confident perſuaſion; and that the unity of the " faith might be kept in divers obſervances. That their " reaſons for this addreſs were many and great, *viz.* That " conſcience was a tender thing, that ought not to be " touch'd or anger'd. That they were neither turbulent, " nor obſtinate, nor willing to ſee the peace of the Church " diſturb'd, or ſtudied novelty, or refus'd to be convinc'd. " But they were taught by conſcience, that things, in their " own nature indifferent, do not always ſeem indifferent " in the opinions of men, and are chang'd by times and " accidents. That this law concerning the reſtoring the " ceremonies of the *Roman* Church, is join'd with the " hazard of ſlavery, neceſſity and ſuperſtition. Which, " *ſay they*, does not ſeem ſo to you, and therefore you are " not to be condemn'd by us; but becauſe it does ſeem " ſo to us, we are not to be vexed by you. That their " conſciences told them, that if they ſhould recollect to " their memories former times, God and Chriſt, and the " faith of the primitive Church were on their ſide.——— " That learned men in our own age lived and died with " them in this faith and opinion. That they, the Biſhops " themſelves, if they might have leave to appeal to their " conſciences, were of the ſame opinion with them; and " that they could wiſh, that all theſe ſtones of offence " were remov'd. They appeal'd to the purer Churches " of *Germany*, *France* and *Scotland*.—In fine, that them- " ſelves were not ignorant what a great ſcandal would " hence ariſe. That the adverſaries would inſult over them " in their afflictions, and would laugh in their ſleeves at " the Biſhops, when they ſaw them thus defending their " cauſe, and purſuing that which they would have: and " would be ſtill more pleas'd with their own inventions, " after they ſhould ſee them not only retain'd by them, " but by them obtruded upon their Brethren. Wherefore " they moſt humbly prayed, that a thing which was the " care and pleaſure of Papiſts, and which the Biſhops had " no great value for themſelves; and laſtly, what they did " not out of any contempt of them, but out of hatred of

" the

" the common enemy, might not be their ſnare, or their " crime. " * This humble, ſtrong and moving Letter, together with ſome ſuch applications to others, would not prevail in their behalf, to ſtop the Biſhops proceedings againſt them. And ſo they were ſoon clapt into Priſon.

MDLXV. The perſecution of the Nonconformiſts ſtill went on. And this year there being a deſign of iſſuing out a Proclamation, for injoining the wearing the habits, and forcing all the Members of the Univerſities thereto; a Letter was writ by ſome of the chief of *Cambridge* to the Secretary of State, their Chancellor, to prevent it. They ſet forth: " That there was a mul- " titude of pious and learned men, who thought in their " conſciences, all uſing of ſuch garments was unlawful for " them. So that by the impoſition thereof they muſt be " compell'd to depart, and the Univerſity would then be " left bare and deſtitute. " † Among the ſubſcribers of this Letter was *John Whitgift*, one who afterwards prov'd a bitter perſecuter. But notwithſtanding this Letter, the matters in diſpute were preſs'd upon them with great vehemence, and they were put to abundance of trouble; as were Miniſters in other parts of the kingdom.

About this time many Letters paſs'd between the *Engliſh* Divines on both ſides, and ſeveral learned Foreigners. Matters were falſly repreſented to them, and great arts were uſed on the Biſhops ſide, to prevent ſuch perſons writing, who, they found, would not write in their behalf; and what they thought made for them, they publiſh'd to the world in a way of triumph. The Foreigners were told, that unleſs they comply'd with the things injoin'd, they muſt let in the Papiſts to ſupply the Cures. Several Foreigners therefore dreading that, and hoping theſe things would ſoon be alter'd, ſpoke more favourably of them than they deſerv'd, and perſuaded the oppoſers of them to ſubmit. But I cannot but remark, how partial thoſe of the Biſhops ſide always ſhew'd themſelves, treating thoſe only with reſpect who wrote in their behalf: and the ſame method continues to this day. Thus, while they applaud ſome of thoſe abroad, who meddled in our controverſy at that time, they cannot have a good word for *Calvin*, *Alaſco*, and

---

* Parker's Life, *p.* 162. 163. † Parker's Life, *p.* 194.

and *Zanchy*: and *Beza* himſelf frequently falls under their cenſure. And if any ſpake againſt any of their impoſitions, they muſt be repreſented as not underſtanding the caſe in diſpute. Thus *Zanchy* is treated by them.*

They proceeded this year in this manner with the *London Clergy*: Upon the Biſhops citation, "ſixty one of "them promis'd Conformity: nine or ten were abſent: "thirty ſeven denied; of which number, as the Arch-"biſhop acknowledg'd, were the beſt, and ſome Preachers. "Theſe were ſuſpended, and put from all manner of Mi-"niſtry; with ſignification, that if they did not reconcile "themſelves within three months, then to be depriv'd. "The Archbiſhop, *ſays my author*, did expect hereupon, "that their behaviour would have been rough and clamo-"rous; but, otherwiſe than he looked for, they ſhewed "reaſonable quietneſs and modeſty. He thought ſome "would come in, when they ſhould feel their wants. "Some he doubted were moved in conſcience, which he "labour'd by ſome advertiſements to pacify." † But however he appear'd reſolv'd to proceed, whether he could pacify their conſciences or not: ſo little regard did he pay to mens conſciences.

Mr. *Strype* tells us, That the Book put forth the year before, intituled: *A Declaration of the Miniſters of the City of* London, ſoon receiv'd an Anſwer; and ſeems to triumph in it, thinking it the Archbiſhop's.‖ But he ſhould have taken notice too, that ſoon after came forth a confutation of that piece; which I have now by me, bearing this title: *An Anſwer for the tyme to the Examination put in print, without the Authours Name, pretending to mayntayne the Apparell preſcribed, againſt the Declaration of the Myniſters of* London. *Printed* 1566. This author anſwers his adverſary paragraph by paragraph, and in my mind, with a great deal of judgment: and I cannot but wonder Mr. *Strype* ſhould ſo applaud the *Examination*, which really appears ſlight enough. I will tranſcribe one paſſage from the Anſwer, becauſe it ſhews what the temper of the *Examiner* was, and how he treated the Miniſters; how little reaſon he had to cite *Bucer* and *Martyr*, ſince he ſo widely differ'd from them; and that the ſuperſtition about the habits MDLXVI.

was

* Life of Grindal, *p.* 106. † Parker's Life, *p.* 215. ‖ Annals, *p.* 482.

was greater, than many car'd then to own; which was a good reason too, why these things should be the more stifly oppos'd. Thus then he: "We desire the reder to "waye this man's writing with the Epistels of *Bucer* and "*Martir*, annexid to the end. And to judg whether the "same spirit be in them both. They bear with the things "tollerable for a tyme, wishing the utter abolishing of "them. This man defendith them as good orders, pro-"fitable to edifie, and therefore mete to be retayned still. "They esteme the resisters as godlie brethrene, he con-"demnith them as schismatikes, bellie-gods, decevers, flat-"terers, fooles, such as have been unlearnedlie brought up "in prophan occupations: puffed up in arrogancie of "themselves, chargeable to vanities of assertions: of whom "it is feared that they make posthast to be Anabaptists "and Libertines: gone out from us, but belike never of "us: differing not much from Donatists, shrinking and "refusing Ministers of *London*: disturbars: factious will-"full entanglers, and encomberers of the consciences of "their herers, girders, nippers, scoffers, biters, snappers "at superiors, having the spirit of irony, like to *Audiani*, "smelling of Donatistrie, or of Papistrie, Rogatianes, "Circumcellians, and Pelagians." If that Treatise be Archbishop *Parker's*, he is a man of a far worse spirit than I took him to be. I question, whether the Popish writers can furnish out such reviling language, as is here gather'd out of him. I will venture any one to compare those two authors, the *Examiner* and *Answerer* together; and I dare say the latter, by any impartial judge, will be allow'd to discover much more good sense and learning, as well as much more civility, in his language than the former.

Many Churches now in *London* were shut up, for want of Ministers, in the room of those who were silenc'd. And this the Archbishop, in a Letter to the Secretary, says, "Was no more than he foresaw before he began; "and that when the Queen put him upon doing what "he had done, he told her; that these precise folks, "[so scoffingly he calls them] would offer their goods "and bodies to prison, rather than they would re-"lent.*

The

* Parker's Life, *p.* 225.

The Archbishop however pretended to be weary of his troublesome work; but one would guess the true reason of his pretence was, that he might draw in the Queen's Council, who were backward, to aid him in it.

Now whereas our Adversaries boast much of one or two Foreigners, who dissuaded our opposing these ceremonies so earnestly; we on our part may boast of the authority of an whole Church, the Church of *Scotland*, who was nearer to us, and better understood our case. The general Assembly this year interpos'd, in a Letter they wrote to the Bishops, earnestly requesting them to forbear to insist upon such trifles. They urge them with the danger of biting and devouring one another; the reasonableness of their dealing with us, as they would be dealt with themselves; who would not be willing their own consciences should be forc'd: "Our Brethren, *say* "*they*, that of conscience refuse that unprofitable appa- "rel, do neither damn yours, nor molest you that use "such vain trifles: if you shall do the like to them, we "doubt not but therein ye shall please God, *&c.*" Mr. *Strype* would represent them as misinformed, because they spoke of many thousands both godly and learned, who refus'd the habits: for, *says he*, as yet the Church was not so well replenish'd. But this is his mistake of their meaning, who speak not of the *English* Ministers, but of Protestants in general: "All, *say they*, that have "knowledge, are not alike persuaded: your consciences "reclaim not at wearing of such garments; but many "thousands, both godly and learned, are otherwise per- "suaded, whose consciences are continually stricken with "those sentences: What hath Christ Jesus to do with "*Belial?* What fellowship is there betwixt light and "darkness?" This year the Parliament also in the lower House made an attempt to reform some things; but that was a work displeasing to the Queen, and so it came to nothing. *

This year also the Dissenters were sorely perse- MDLXVII. cuted. By the examination of some of them we learn their case. † In the reign of Queen *Mary* there was a little company at *London*, who, being desirous of keeping themselves free from

* Annals, *p.* 498. † Part of a Register, *p.* 23, *&c.*

from the *Romiſh* ſuperſtitions, avoided the public ſervice, and uſed to meet together to worſhip God, in the manner appointed in his word. They were in great danger oftentimes, and ſometimes they were taken, and ſeveral of them were put to death. They expected to be eas'd of perſecution when Queen *Elizabeth* came to the crown, and Proteſtant Biſhops were placed in the Church: but when they ſaw the Popiſh ceremonies retain'd, and godly Miniſters ſilenc'd for not ſubſcribing, and a mercenary generation of men kept in, who a little before had been violent Papiſts, and many of them inſtrumental in ſhedding the blood of Chriſt's Martyrs; they were not eaſie to attend upon ſuch a Miniſtry. *Coverdale*, who had been Biſhop of *Exeter*, and hated the ſuperſtitions, the government thought fit to continue; and therefore he was conniv'd at, and us'd to preach up and down in the city. To him theſe people applied themſelves, deſiring to know where they might hear him; but he, thro' fear of giving diſguſt to the government, did not care to acquaint them before hand where he was to preach. When they found themſelves thus depriv'd of the word of God, and were put into the Biſhop's Courts for not coming to Church, they reſolv'd to have a Congregation of their own privately; and to this end they hir'd the *Plumbers* Hall, as tho' it had been for a wedding, but the chief uſe of it was for religions worſhip. About an hundred of them met there, and uſed the *Geneva ſervice*. Here they were diſturb'd by the Sheriffs, and fourteen or fifteen of them taken, and ſent to the Compter. Seven or eight of them were brought the next day before the Lord Mayor, Biſhop *Grindal*, Dean *Goodman*, Mr. *Wattes*, and other Commiſſioners. The Biſhop fell hard upon them, and charg'd them with lying, for hiring the houſe under pretence of a wedding, but would not ſtay to hear their defence: the Biſhop charg'd them with condemning the whole ſtate of the Church, reform'd in King *Edward*'s days; which was, *ſays he*, well reform'd according to the word of God; yea, and many good men have ſhed their blood for the ſame, which your doings condemn. Such poor ſtuff has been commonly in the mouths of our Adverſaries, who learnt it from the Papiſts, who continually urg'd the Proteſtants not to reject the religion of their fathers. What ſignifies it who approv'd of a thing, if it has not its warrant from God's word? What hurt is there

there in condemning any fallible men, if differing from their opinion muſt be call'd condemning them? At this rate it had been unlawful for the Biſhops to have attempted a farther Reformation, which yet they always deny'd. As to the other pretence: If the Martyrs in Queen *Mary's* reign had ſhed their blood only in defence of the matters oppos'd by us, they had been unworthy of the character of Martyrs: They ſuffer'd only for thoſe things, wherein they agreed with us. But to go on: The poor people were urg'd with the teſtimonies of *Beza* and *Bullinger*, to which they gave their anſwers: but the chief argument urg'd againſt them was, the authority of the Prince. And tho' theſe men anſwer'd with ſome briskneſs, and perhaps ſometimes a little rudeneſs; yet whoever will read the account, will ſee, their judges treated them far worſe, uſing taunting language, and asking enſnaring queſtions, and ſcrewing their anſwers to the worſt ſenſe. Theſe poor men were threaten'd to have their freedom of the city taken from them, beſide other puniſhment, unleſs they would conform. They were all, at leaſt all but one, remanded to priſon, and there twenty four of them, beſide ſeven women, were kept above a year. *

In this year Mr. *Strype* places the ſtory of *Cummin*, a *Dominican*, his preaching among the Nonconformiſts: which is ſo notorious, palpable, and ſilly a forgery (as has been abundantly prov'd †) that it is an intolerable ſhame for men of ſenſe and reputation to mention it. But it happen'd to be a lie on the right ſide, and therefore muſt by all means be maintain'd. Juſt ſuch another is the ſtory of one *Thomas Heath*, plac'd in the next year.

This year another great controverſy aroſe, which afterwards was the occaſion of much perſecution; it was about *Chriſt's deſcent into Hell*; and there were ſeveral of our Biſhops, who were for ruining thoſe, who would not hold that Chriſt went into the hell of the damn'd.

We are now come to the year, wherein the MDLXXI. XXXIX Articles were confirm'd by Act of Parliament; concerning which Dr. *Nichols* has theſe words: *By this Act all Miniſters, of every quality, being oblig'd to ſubſcribe to theſe Articles, thereby obliging themſelves to conform to the*

* Grind. Life, *p.* 136. † Anſw. to Dr. Scot.

*rites of the Church, and submit to Episcopal government; several Puritanical Ministers chose rather to be depriv'd of their preferments, than to approve those rites, and that form of government in the Church, which in their sermons they had so loudly inveigh'd against. Some of them, more fierce then the rest, began presently to set up separate Meetings. By this means, these very learned men, and otherwise well deserving upon account of our common religion, out of a nice punctilio of honour, or to gratifie a peevish humour, did not stick to disturb the peace of the Church in the most egregious manner, and to sow the seeds of perpetual distraction among us.** But who can forbear wondering at these unreasonable men, who blame us that we can't follow their example, and appear in as many shapes, as different times and seasons may require? We know well enough their art of *approving those things, which in their sermons they had* a little before *loudly inveigh'd against.* Thus without standing upon any *nice punctilio of honour*, they resisted King *James* II. and taught others to do so too; altho' they had pretended *in their sermons* a little before, that no man could resist him, but upon the peril of eternal damnation. We own, we are of another principle, and judge of good and evil, not by Act of Parliament, but by the laws of Christ. And the things which, with a good conscience, we assert are evil, we always esteem so, 'till the contrary is prov'd to us by arguments fetch'd from the Holy Scriptures, and not from the laws of the land. But I would fain know, how the Episcopal party of that time can be said to have had any regard to *the peace of the Church*; while they prefer'd their ceremonies to it, and not only silenc'd, but grievously, and sometimes even unto death, punish'd Ministers, whom they acknowledge to have been *learned men, and well deserving, upon the account of our common religion?* Besides, as it appears from what I have said already, the beginning of this separation was before this Act of Parliament, when the forward Bishops requir'd subscription, without being impower'd by the law of the land.

But against this separation our Author, in the next place, produces the authority of *Beza*, whom upon good reason we highly esteem: but yet we declare, we pay not

* *Page* 23.

not that deference to the judgment of any man, however learned and pious, as to ſuffer ourſelves to be determin'd by it, in ſpite of the dictates of our own conſciences. And indeed how ſhall we come to any concluſion at all, if we were to judge after this rate? For if *Beza* had been againſt us, there were other learned men who were on our ſide. But if the matter be throughly examin'd, our Adverſaries will have no great reaſon to boaſt of *Beza*'s authority. He liv'd at a great diſtance, and did not know the temper of the Queen, or our Adverſaries; and therefore flatter'd himſelf with hopes, that a farther Reformation of religion would ſoon be made: and if, thro' his earneſt deſire of peace among us, any thing drop'd from him unadviſedly, allowance ſhall be made for the goodneſs of his deſign. I am ſure, if our Adverſaries pay any regard to his authority, they muſt lay aſide thoſe things which we contend about, ſince he utterly diſapprov'd them. That he thought meanly of our Reformation may appear from his own words: "When you "ſay the Reformation in *England* was manag'd according "to the advice and deſire of *Bucer*, you very much "wrong that good man——— Whence ſhall we better "learn what *Bucer* moſt approv'd, and would have or-"der'd, if he might, than from the Church, at *Straſ-"burg?* ——— In the rites of that Church, where ſhall "we meet with thoſe odious ſtipulations, of which you "boaſt, or Exorciſm, or the ſign of the Croſs, or "Chriſm?"* If then *Beza* eſteem'd the ſtipulations, perſcrib'd in Baptiſm in our Common Prayer, to be odious; if he thought *Bucer* wrong'd, when they were father'd upon him; how could he be conſiſtent with himſelf in adviſing us to uſe them? Can we think *things odious* are to be us'd in the worſhip of God, even when they are commanded by the civil magiſtrate? But while he was too eagerly deſirous of peace, he give ſuch advice, as poſſibly he would not, upon a fuller examination of the caſe. Thus *Peter Martyr* adviſ'd *Hooper* to ſubmit to wearing the habits; and yet afterwards was at leaſt very doubtful what advice to give, if he did not give the quite contrary. "As to the habits, which "are to be uſed, as holy, in public adminiſtrations,

* Anſwer to Baldwin.

" Mr. *Bullinger* thinks, ſince they carry in them a re-
" ſemblance of the Maſs, and are mere relicks of Popery,
" you ought not to uſe them, leſt your example ſhould
" encourage that which is the cauſe of offence. As to
" my ſelf, tho' I always diſlik'd the uſe of thoſe orna-
" ments; yet, becauſe I ſaw there was an immediate dan-
" ger, leſt you ſhould be ſilenced, and there might be
" ſome hope, that as Altars and Images are laid aſide, ſo
" theſe reſemblances of the Maſs might be taken away
" alſo, if you and ſome others, accepting of Biſhop-
" ricks, us'd your beſt endeavours to this purpoſe; which
" might be very much hinder'd by the promotion of
" ſuch, who might not barely be indifferent, whether
" theſe relicks of Popery were aboliſh'd, but might en-
" courage and defend them: I was the more backward
" in perſwading you to refuſe the Biſhoprick, rather than
" ſubmit to the uſing theſe habits; but when I conſider'd,
" that we are to avoid all manner of ſcandals of this
" ſort, I eaſily fell in with *Bullinger*'s opinion. This is
" all I can ſay at preſent; do you, for your part, take
" care to do nothing againſt your conſcience." * But
let us hear what *Beza* ſays, concerning our controverſy;
" Certainly, as to our ſelves, we would not take the
" function of the Miniſtry on this condition; no, tho' it
" was offer'd, much leſs ſeek it. Yet thoſe, to whom
" the Lord this way hath open'd an entrance to propa-
" gate the glory of his kingdom, we exhort; that they
" hold out ſtrongly in the fear of the Lord, yet on this
" condition added: that they may holily and religiouſly
" diſcharge their intire Miniſtry; and moreover, accord-
" ing to their office, propound and urge ſuch matters, as
" tend to put theſe things into a better ſtate. [But nei-
" ther of theſe were the Miniſters ever allow'd to do.] For
" otherwiſe, if this liberty be taken from them, [as it
" certainly and plainly was] and they are commanded af-
" ter this manner to wink at a manifeſt abuſe, ſo as even
" to approve of what, 'tis evident, wants to be amended;
" what elſe may we adviſe, than that they chuſe rather
" to live privately, than to cheriſh an evil againſt their
" con-

* Letter to a Friend in Engl.

" conſcience, which, in a ſhort time, will neceſſarily " draw with it the whole ruine of the Churches? " * All impartial judges muſt grant theſe expreſſions of that learned man are too mild and gentle; for certainly when ſuch an evil is breaking in, as threatens the *whole ruine of the Churches*, it muſt be the duty of Miniſters, not ſneakingly to withdraw themſelves, but to appear couragiouſly againſt it. A little farther in his Letter he has theſe words: " Altho' we think, that civil and politic order is by no " means to be diſapprov'd, whereby not only the orders " of citizens, but of offices are diſtinguiſh'd; yet we " think every diſtinction is not to be approv'd. For what " if Miniſters be commanded to wear ſuch habits as Buf- " foons, or Stage players uſe? Would it not be a manifeſt " mockery of the eccleſiaſtical function? But in this caſe " we ſeem to be guilty of a worſe evil; becauſe not only " hath the Lord render'd that prieſtly habit ridiculous to " many Papiſts themſelves, but it appears polluted and " defiled with innumerable ſuperſtitions." Hence therefore, as well as by ſeveral other paſſages of that Letter, it appears, *Beza* was againſt our ſubſcribing to thoſe things, which he thought we might bear with. But the ſtate of our controverſy has been very much alter'd ſince that time: no ſubſcription was then requir'd by law, as it was afterward. Farther, he calls the ſign of the Croſs, *a moſt execrable ſuperſtition:* the putting of queſtions to infants when baptiz'd, he ſays, is *needleſs and fooliſh:* kneeling at the Sacrament he reckons among thoſe *defilements*, *which ought to be purg'd away:* Baptiſm adminiſtred by Midwives, he ſays, *is intolerable:* and he declares, that *Miniſters ſhould earneſtly reprove the retaining ſuch an abuſe; but by no means allow ſuch falſe Baptiſm:* and yet Archbiſhop *Parker*, at that time, allow'd of it. Midwifery being a ſpiritual imployment, the giving a licence for it belong'd to him. Mr. *Strype* has given us the oath he preſcrib'd for ſuch; in which are theſe words: " Alſo " that in the miniſtration of the ſacrament of Baptiſm, " in the time of neceſſity, I will uſe apt and the ac- " cuſtom'd words of the ſame Sacrament, that is to ſay, " theſe words following, or to the like effect: *I chriſten* " *thee in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy* " *Ghoſt,*

* Strype's *Tranſl.* of Beza's Letter, *App. to* Grind. Life, *p.*

" *Ghoſt*: and none other profane words. And that in " ſuch time of neceſſity, in baptizing any infant born, " and pouring water upon the head of the ſame infant, " I will uſe pure and clean water, and not any roſe or " damask water, or water made of any confection or " mixture: and that I will certify the Curate of the pa- " riſh Church of every ſuch baptizing." * And yet *Grindal* and *Horn* had the conſcience to write *Bullinger* and *Walter* word, " That they did by no means allow, " that women might or ought to baptize children." † Which I would have obſerv'd, as an inſtance of thoſe unfair repreſentations they made of the ſtate of our affairs, in order to procure Letters againſt us from the Foreign Divines.

But let us hear *Beza*'s judgment of our Eccleſiaſtical Courts. This account of them, he tells us, had been given him: " That excommunications and abſolutions, " in ſome Epiſcopal Courts in *England*, are executed, " not according to the ſentence of the Presbytery, (be- " cauſe there is none there) nor according to the word " of God; but by the authority of ſome Lawyers, and " ſuch others; yea ſometimes, of ſome one man, and " indeed for mere mony cauſes, or matter civil; and " other things of that nature, as was wont to be done in " Popery." Theſe things ſeem'd incredible to that learned man, which yet every one in *England* knows to be the practice continued among us to this very day. Of theſe things, if true, he thus gives his judgment: " Tru- " ly we think, that, by ſuch judgments, a man is not, " any more bound before God, than by Papal excom- " munications: and as much we wiſh this torturing " mens conſciences, and foul profanation of eccleſiaſtical " and purely ſpiritual juriſdiction, were the very firſt op- " portunity aboliſh'd by the Queen's authority, as the " corruptions of doctrine; and that Presbyteries and " Deaconries were ſet up, according to the Word of " God, and the Canons of the pure Church. Which, " unleſs it be done, we fear in truth, leſt this be the be- " ginning of many calamities; which, however, I pray " God avert. For it is certain, the Son of God will one " day

* Annals, *p.* 502. † Burn. Hiſt. Ref. *Part* III. Collect. Rec. *p.* 343.

" day severely revenge from heaven such manifest abuses,
" whereby consciences are disturb'd, unless some remey
" be used. In the mean time, we think, what is not
" rightly done, is rightly born with, by those, who can-
" not alter the thing itself; but yet only thus far, that
" they approue not the thing itself, and use patience as a
" remedy against an unjust oppression. But if they be
" prest so far, as to be compell'd not only to bear this
" course, but to approve of this excommunication, as
" lawful, and by suing for unlawful absolution, mani-
" festly to assent to that abuse; we advise them rather
" to bear any thing, than act against their consciences."

All these moderate and healing counsels of that good man were owing very much to his hopes, than a farther Reformation would be made by the Queen and her Bishops; but he was sadly disappointed; and since that time, all things have grown worse and worse. But by the passages I have set down it appears, our Adversaries have no occasion to triumph, upon the account of that Letter.

Our Author next falls hard upon Mr. *Cartwright*. *But tho' the separation was hinder'd then, it was begun some few years afterwards by Mr.* Thomas Cartwright, *a Divine of the University of* Cambridge; *being led on to these precipitate proceedings by a particular resentment of his own, which was occasion'd by the Queen's commending Dr.* Preston's *way of disputing before* Cartwright's, *who was his Antagonist, in a public disputation before the Queen, when she came to see that University. For that reverend person, by the sweetness of his voice, and the modesty of his behaviour, did extraordinarily please the Queen; while the other, by his natural haughtiness and roughness, seem'd to spoil the force of his arguments. This disgrace bore so hard upon his proud spirit, that he was resolv'd to leave the nation, and to take a journey to* Geneva. *

When Dr. *Fuller* tells this story, he thus introduces it: *If any author may be believ'd.* † The *author*, he means, is the same Sir *George Paul*, cited by Dr. *Nichols*. He wrote rather a Panegyric upon Archbishop *Whitgift*, that a true account of his life: and because *Whitgift* was always a

* *Page* 25. † Hist. of Cambr. *p.* 139.

bitter enemy to *Cartwright*, he endeavours to magnifie his hero by perpetually abuſing his adverſary. He ſays, " *Preſton*, for his comely geſture, and pleaſing pronun- " ciation, was both liked, and rewarded by her Majeſty; " but *Cartwright* receiv'd neither reward, nor commen- " dation.——This, his no ſmall grief, he utter'd unto di- " vers of his intimate friends — That immediately after " her Majeſty's neglect of him, he began to wade into " divers opinions, as that of the diſcipline, and to kick " againſt her eccleſiaſtical government."

But Dr. *Fuller* here honeſtly adds: " But Mr. *Cart-* " *wright*'s followers (who lay the foundation of his diſ- " affection to the diſcipline eſtabliſhed, in his conſcience, " not carnal diſcontentment) credit not the relation: ad- " ding moreover, that the Queen did highly commend, " tho' not reward him."

Now who moſt deſerve credit, inveterate enemies, or friends? Certainly, if we pay any regard to juſtice and equity, we muſt paſs a more favourable ſentence, than Sir *George Paul* does, upon *Cartwright*: for if his account were true, and *Cartwright* had no other cauſe of diſ- content; Who can imagine, ſo very learned and good a man would plunge himſelf into ſo many troubles upon ſo ſlight an occaſion? Beſides, 'tis not probable, that moſt politic Queen, who us'd her art to win the favour of the loweſt of the people, would diſoblige a learned man in the Univerſity, by denying him his deſerv'd praiſe; and eſpecially at a time, when ſhe was ſtriving to ingra- tiate her ſelf with the Univerſity in general. None of our Adverſaries, who have any learning themſelves, will deny, that *Cartwright* was a very learned man: nor does *Fuller* deny his being far ſuperior to *Preſton* in learning. But let us ſuppoſe, the Queen did not commend, nay, that ſhe deſpis'd *Cartwright*; Who can imagine he could be ſo exceedingly diſturb'd upon ſuch an account? If he had been a Courtier indeed, there would be more of pro- bability in the ſtory; but Academics, and eſpecially ſuch as have a *natural haughtineſs and roughneſs*, don't uſe to make much account of the judgment of a woman, who ſhould very much regard men for their comely behaviour; which, *Fuller* aſſures us, was Queen *Elizabeth*'s manner. But if Mr. *Clark*, the writer of *Cartwright*'s life, is to be credited; *Cartwright* did not go to *Geneva* at the time pre-

pretended, nor 'till he was turn'd out of his Profeſſorſhip: Which ſhews this is a downright forgery. 'Tis certain, he was choſen the Lady *Margaret*'s Profeſſor, after the Queen had been at *Cambridge:* By which, as well as many things beſides, it appears, how great a reſpect the Univerſity had for him: And if his mind had been diſturb'd by his pretended diſgrace; no doubt the honour the Univerſity did him, in chuſing him Profeſſor, before he took his journey to *Geneva*, would have ſufficiently pacified him. And if 'twas true, that Queen *Elizabeth* had no great opinion of *Cartwright*'s learning, when ſhe was at *Cambridge*, 'tis very probable (as I ſhall elſewhere ſhew) ſhe was of another mind afterwards. But Mr. *Strype* has confuted this ſtory, whoſe words I ſhall tranſcribe: "Reports have commonly been ſpread, that the "cauſe of *Cartwright*'s ſetting himſelf ſo openly againſt "the Hierarchy, as he did ſoon after, was from a diſ"guſt he took at this time; as tho' the Queen ſhewed "more countenance to the other diſputants, than to him. "But by the *Relation* of the Queen's reception at *Cam*"*bridge* (now in the hands of a learned member of that "Univerſity) there appears no clear ground for any ſuch "diſcontent. For the Queen is there ſaid to have ap"prov'd them all; only that *Preſton* pleas'd her moſt, "and was made her Scholar, with the ſettlement of a "yearly honorary ſalary on him." *

But let us go on with the Doctor, and ſee what Mr. *Cartwright* did at *Geneva: Being there ſome time, to inform himſelf of the* Calvinian *doctrines, he ſoon after returns to* England. *And having then conceiv'd greater averſions to the* Engliſh *conſtitution, which before he had not the kindeſt thoughts of, he begins now openly to declaim againſt it.*

If *he had not before the kindeſt thoughts of the* Engliſh *Conſtitution*, they don't deſerve much credit, who pretend he was *led* into the meaſures he took, *by a particular reſentment of his own.* But of what *doctrines* could he be *inform'd* at *Geneva*, which he might not have been fully taught here at home? The doctrine of the Church of *England*, at that time, did not vary an hair's breadth from that of *Geneva:* The Epiſcopal Clergy had then no con-

* Annals, *p.* 403.

controverſy with the Divines of *Geneva*, about any doctrinal Articles: nor was there any ſuch, between the friends of the Hierarchy and *Cartwright*, or any of the Puritans. I challenge them to produce any Epiſcopal approv'd writer, before Archbiſhop *Laud*'s faction, who ever charg'd *Cartwright*, or any of the Puritans, with any error in doctrinal Matters. Let Biſhop *Charleton* judge of this: "This uniformity, *ſays he*, of doctrine was held "in our Church, without diſturbance, as long as thoſe "worthy Biſhops lived, who were employed in the Re- "formation: for albeit the *Puritans* diſquieted our "Church about their conceived *diſcipline*, yet they ne- "ver moved any quarrel againſt the *doctrine* of our "Church; which is well to be obſerved: for if they "had embraced any doctrine, which the Church of "*England* denied, they would aſſuredly have quarrell'd "about that, as well as they did about the diſcipline. "But it was then the open confeſſion both of the Biſh- "ops, and of the Puritans, that both parts embraced a "mutual conſent in doctrine, only the difference was in "matter of Inconformity. Then hitherto there was no "Puritan doctrine known." * In like manner ſpeaks Dr. *Crackanthorp*: "You never ſaw in *England* a Pu- "ritan, that was an Heretic: there is no quarrel between "us and the Puritans concerning faith, or any doctrines "of faith: our Church and they contend about rites "and diſcipline, but we conſent and agree in matters of "faith." †

Mr. *Richard Hooker*, Biſhop *Hall*, and a great many other Epiſcopal writers, are cited by Dr. *Edwards*, as all ſaying the ſame thing. Nay, Archbiſhop *Whitgift* was well inform'd in the ſame *Calvinian* doctrine with *Cartwright*, as appears by the *Lambeth Articles*; and therefore we never find, that he twitted *Cartwright* with any doctrinal error of *Calviniſm*. But on the contrary, I find theſe words of his cited from him: "To traduce *Calvin* "in pulpits, I can by no means like; neither do I allow "the ſame towards *Auguſtine*, *Jerom*, and other learned "Fathers. ‖

What

* Examination of the Appeal, *p.* 7, 8. † *See* Edw. Verit. Redux. *p.* 550. ‖ Ibid. *p.* 535.

What *Calvinian Divinity* could he then learn at *Geneva?* Nay, what could he learn there, that ſhould put him upon doing any diſſervice to the Church of *England?* Who at *Geneva* was likely to exaſperate him againſt the Church of *England? Calvin* was dead before this time. Who was there then at *Geneva* to inſtruct him, except it was *Beza*, who was the principal perſon both in their Church and Univerſity, after *Calvin*'s death? And indeed there was always a very particular friendſhip between *Beza* and *Cartwright*, after they once became acquainted at *Geneva:* and *Beza* gave him this commendation, that he thought *the ſun did not ſee a more learned man.* But what hurt could the Church receive from any inſtructions of *Beza?* For concerning him, our Author ſpeaks thus honourably: *But that they might not run into the precipitate method of ſeparation, they were hinder'd by a Letter of Mr.* Theodorus Beza, *that moſt eminent Divine of* Geneva; *who, as for his other eminent abilities, ſo particularly for this great act of charity, deſerves commendation to all poſterity.* The converſation therefore of ſuch a man could never exaſperate *Cartwright* againſt the Church. One would think, our Adverſaries were about to tell us, that *Beza* wrote inconſiderately at firſt; and that afterwards, when *Cartwright* had better inform'd him of the ſtate of our controverſy, he chang'd his mind, and thereupon ſtirr'd him up to make a vigorous oppoſition againſt the Church.

He publicly caſts out his reflections upon the order of Biſhops, the Liturgy and the Surplice, in his ſermons which he preach'd. Without all doubt, it was very commendable in *Cartwright*, that he found fault in his ſermons with thoſe things, which were amiſs in our Reformation. And why ſhould it not be as lawful to do ſo in the reign of Queen *Elizabeth*, as in that of King *Henry*, her Father? Unleſs the corruptions, that are crept into the worſhip of God, be laid open and expos'd in the ſermons and writings of learned men, whence can we expect a removal of them? Some of the Foreign Divines advis'd the diſſatisfied Miniſters, at that time, to ſubmit to the uſe of the habits; but not one of them ever attempted to perſwade them to abſtain from ſpeaking againſt them: on the contrary, they exhorted them to uſe their utmoſt endeavours, publicly and privately, to get them aboliſh'd. And therefore I can ſee no reaſon, why *Cartwright*, or any

any other Miniſters, ſhould be blam'd for diſcharging a good conſcience in that reſpect.

Dr. Whitgift, *who was Maſter of the ſame College, anſwer'd from the pulpit his ſermons conſtantly, as he preach'd them, with very great ſtrength of argument.* If he did, he preach'd with a great deal more ſtrength of argument, than he was ever able to write; as any one muſt acknowledge, who will be at the pains of looking into the printed controverſy. But I had rather Dr. *Fuller*, a man of *Whitgift*'s one ſide, ſhould give judgment between him and his adverſary: "The reſult, *ſays he*, of the "difference betwixt them is this; that (leaving the con- "troverſy itſelf to the judgment of others) if *Cartwright* "had the better of it in his learning, *Whitgift* had the "advantage in his temper; and which is the main, he "had more power to back, if fewer people to follow "him.

He frequently invited him likewiſe to debate the ſame matters in a public conference; which he as often declining, and ſhewing an unwillingneſs to make any recantation of his doctrine, he expels him out of Trinity College, *where he was Fellow. And the ſame year, being Vice Chancellor of the Univerſity, he, for the ſame reaſons, procures his ejection out of the* Margaret *Profeſſor's place, which he enjoy'd.* It does not appear to be true, that *Cartwright* was ever *invited to a public conference*; but on the contrary, * when he himſelf deſir'd they might have one, he was bid to obtain the Queen's licenſe for it; without which ſuch a conference could not be held, according to law. And by the pretty large account which Mr. *Strype* has given of this matter, it appears, that *Cartwright* and *Whitgift* had frequently conferr'd about theſe matters; but there is not the leaſt hint, that ever Mr. *Cartwright* was invited to, or declin'd a public conference.

After I had written this, I met with ſuch paſſages, as fully clear this matter, and confirm what I have ſaid: that *Whitgift* never challeng'd *Cartwright*; but *Cartwright* him, to a *public conference.* Thus *Cartwright* ſays, 'twas untrue, that he refus'd his conference: "For beſide that "I anſwer'd, that it was meet that the doctrine, which "I had openly taught, ſhould be defended openly; and "beſide

* *See* Full. Hiſt. Cambr. *p.* 142.

" beſide that alſo I went to two of the Univerſity Doc-
" tors, to be conferr'd with; I offer'd my ſelf to his
" private conference; which altho' he had promis'd; yet
" under pretence that I was (as he ſaid) incorrigible, he
" would not perform. The truth is, he offer'd private
" conference by writing, but having before experience of
" his unfaithfulneſs many ways, I refus'd it."*

Whitgift inſiſts upon no more than what *Cartwright* owns, and ſufficiently hints, he avoided a public conference without the magiſtrates leave: " I have *ſays he*,
" ſundry times, both privately and publicly, as I am able
" to prove by ſufficient teſtimonies, and you cannot deny,
" offer'd you conference by writing of theſe matters; I
" have earneſtly moved you to it, and you have always
" refus'd it — Howbeit, I refuſe no way, that ſhall be
" thought convenient to the magiſtrate."†

I cannot here but take notice, how very differently Secretary *Cecyl* ſpeaks of *Cartwright*, from what our Adverſaries commonly do. " What mind, *ſays he*, *Cart-*
" *wright* had in the moving of theſe matters, by himſelf
" in communication, I perceive the ſame not to be much
" reprehended; being, as it ſeemeth, not of any arro-
" gancy, or intention to move troubles; but as a reader
" of the Scripture, to give notes, by way of compariſon,
" between the order of the Miniſtry in the times of the
" Apoſtles, and the preſent times now in this Church of
" *England*."‖

The Secretary, who was the Chancellor of *Cambridge*, in the ſame Letter order'd, the diſpute ſhould be ſtop'd for the preſent on both ſides; letting them know, that *Cartwright* had agreed to it. But the forward Gentlemen of the Univerſity outrun their Chancellor, and inſtead of forbearing diſputes expell'd *Cartwright*.

When *Cartwright* openly declar'd his mind in certain propoſitions, he ſubſcrib'd this ſentence to them: " Every
" one ought to endeavour a Reformation of theſe things
" according to his ſtation. When I ſay, according to
" his ſtation, I mean, that a Magiſtrate by his authority,
" a Miniſter by his preaching, and all by their prayers
" ſhould farther it." And this being his principle, he could not be blam'd that he endeavour'd in his own ſtation,

* Second Reply, *Pref.* p. 10. † Defence, *p.* 354. ‖ Annals, *p.* 586.

tion, as a Minister, to promote the reformation he propos'd. And especially, since I find, by a Letter of Bishop *Grindal*, he added this caution: "That whatever was done "in this cause, must be done without tumult or sedi-"tion."* That Letter of *Grindal* leads me to remark these two things farther out of it.

1. That *Cartwright* was in a very great esteem at that time in the University. He says: "The youth of the U-"niversity, which is at this time very toward in learning, "doth frequent his Lectures in great numbers." This may raise a suspicion, that one great cause of the rigidness of some in the University, who oppos'd him, was owing to their envy at his great reputation. Was there nothing of this, do we think, in *Whitgift*'s changing his mind? that he, who a few years before, join'd with some others in a Letter, wherein they desire the habits might not be impos'd in the University; "because there was a multitude "of pious and learned men, who thought in their consci-"ences, all using of such garments was unlawful for them; "so that by the imposition thereof they must be compell'd "to depart, and the University would then be left desti-"tute: — *declaring*, that as far as they were able to "judge, the not laying this burden upon them (especially "in the present circumstances of the University) was "not likely to be attended with any hazard or inconve-"nience:"† that he, I say, should now be so eager in proceeding against *Cartwright* for these things?

2. I can't but here observe, how dangerous 'tis for men to strain their consciences, and how easily they then run farther than themselves design'd. *Grindal* was displeas'd that our Reformation was not more perfect, and was of that sort of Bishops, who *promis'd not to urge their Brethren in these things:* and yet upon this occasion he wrote a virulent Letter to Secretary *Cecyl*, to stir him up to persecute *Cartwright* and his friends; and complain'd of the University, as too backward in this affair. And this he seems to have done very officiously, when he had no manner of occasion for it.

After this he runs throughout all the nation, bitterly inveighing, in his Sermons, against the establish'd Church; and whomsoever he could find to have conceiv'd any dislike against the

* Life, *p.* 162. † Parker's Life, App. *p.* 69, 70.

the eccleſiaſtical conſtitution, he never left them till he had made them ſworn enemies againſt the Engliſh *Hierarchy.* This is a device, I ſuppoſe, of our Author's; at leaſt he neither mentions, nor do I remember, what authority he has for it. But there is a ſtrange inclination in men, to aſperſe ſuch, as they have already injur'd. I can't but here take notice of the baſeneſs and inhumanity of *Whitgift* towards him; who, after he had turn'd him out of his Profeſſorſhip and Fellowſhip, talks to him after this rate: "What commodities you want, that I have, I cannot conjecture: your meat and drink is provided with leſs trouble and charges unto you, and in more delicate and dainty manner, than mine is: your eaſe and pleaſure ten times more; you do what you liſt, go when you liſt, come when you liſt, ſpeak when you liſt, at your pleaſure. What would you have more? I know not why you ſhould complain, except you be of the ſame diſpoſition with the *Franciſcan* Friars; who when they have fill'd their bellies at other mens tables, were wont to cry out and ſay: *How many things are we forc'd to endure?* Some men are delighted to be fed at other mens tables, and prefer popular Fame before gold and ſilver."* Let not any think ſo hard of this man, as that he ſpake out of envy, grieving that Mr. *Cartwright*, when he was turn'd out, ſhould meet with any kindneſs in the world: without doubt, he deſign'd hereby to ſet forth his own great courteſy, and readineſs to do his adverſary a kind office; and purely for *Cartwright*'s eaſe, and to make his life the more pleaſant, he turn'd him out. If *Whitgift* truly thought the looſing preferments was ſuch an advantage, and did not write theſe things with a baſe hypocriſy, why was he himſelf ſo greedy of preferments? Much ſuch another paſſage we meet with elſewhere: "But I muſe, with "what *face* you can ſeek to *deface* true Paſtors, that do "good in the Church, though not ſo much as you think "they ſhould do; ſeeing you your ſelf, and a number "more, do no good at all in any place; but only range "up and down, live at other mens tables, diſturb the "Church, and think that you have done your duties, "when you have defac'd other mens doings. I am verily "perſuaded that he which preacheth at his own Cure but "one

* Defence, *p.* 283.

" one ſermon in a year, offendeth God leſs, than you do, " that have forſaken your calling. " * This is the profound reaſoning of this mighty diſputant! He is for putting a gag in a man's mouth, and then is angry he does not talk. *Cartwright* no otherwiſe forſook his calling, than as a man forſakes his money, when he meets with a highway man; becauſe he can't keep it.

This year the two Archbiſhops were buſy in perſecuting the chief of the Puritan Miniſters. Eight of them were ſingled out by them, as objects of their fury, to be depriv'd, if they refus'd Conformity. †. *Lever* now reſign'd his Prebend, and what was done to the reſt is uncertain. ‖

Beſides the eight mention'd before, Mr. *Strype* places the troubles of two other Miniſters this year; Mr. *Edward Deringe*, and Mr. *Robert Johnſon*. The former of theſe was a younger Brother of a good family, and a man of a bold and couragious ſpirit, and extraordinary pious. He wrote a Defence of Biſhop *Jewel* againſt *Harding*. He preach'd ſometimes before the Queen, who was much offended with him, and forbad his preaching in her dominions, as I find by his Letters. He was a ſtrict Puritan, and the Biſhops fell ſeverely upon him; and more particularly the Archbiſhop of *Canterbury* uſed him very roughly, as indeed he was a grievous perſecuter. Mr. *Strype* cites ſome Articles he ſubſcrib'd before the Abp. and the other Commiſſioners. One of them was: He did not believe that Chriſt, either in body or ſoul, went down to the damned. Another: That the garments, juſtly term'd Popiſh, were full of offence ‡. But in another book I find more of their proceedings againſt him *. Twenty Articles or queſtions were propounded to him, and he requir'd to give his anſwer to them in writing, as he did: ſome of them, about ſtate matters, ſeem to be deſign'd to enſnare him: others were to draw him in, either to approve or condemn the corruptions then in vogue. And I cannot but much wonder particularly at the 14th, which is: " Whether any ec- " cleſiaſtical perſon, may have more eccleſiaſtical livings " than one, or not?" What could theſe Commiſſioners deſign by putting this queſtion? Did they imagine 'twould be a crime to ſpeak againſt pluralities, which the Papiſts bluſh at?

---

* Defence, *p.* 241. † Grindal's Life, *p.* 170. ‖ Parker's Life, *p.* 325. Ibid, *p.* 326. Part of a Regiſter, *p.* 71.

at? In general all those Articles seem to be put to wreck his conscience, and get somewhat out of him, to make him an offender by his own confession. For my part, when I consider the abominable tyranny of all such proceedings, and the barbarous wickedness of sifting the secrets of mens hearts, about matters, of which perhaps they never spake any thing before; I heartily bless my God, that he did not cast my lot in such days, but reserv'd me for times of more equity and freedom.

They requir'd him also to subscribe to four other Articles, which, I suppose, were generally insisted upon with all, at this time; and therefore I shall set them down.

1. "I acknowledge the Book of Articles (agreed upon "by the Clergy, in a Synod, 1563, and confirm'd by the "Queen's Majesty) to be sound, and according to the "Word of God.

He refus'd to subscribe this Article, excepting against the Article concerning the consecration of Bishops and Archbishops. And by what he says of it, one would think, they urg'd a subscription upon others beside Ministers. "To what purpose, *says he*, is this Article put in? Or "what reason is there to make all, both men and women, "subscribe unto it?— Let him allow it, that hath profit by it: and he that liketh it not, let him have no "Bishoprick." He excepted likewise against the Article concerning the *Homilies*.

2. "The Queen's Majesty is the chief Governour, "next under Christ, of this Church of *England*, as well "in ecclesiastical, as civil causes."

Of this he says: "The second Article I freely acknow-"ledge.".

3. "I acknowledge, that in the Book of Common-"Prayer is nothing evil, or repugnant to the Word of "God; but that it may be well us'd in this our Chri-"stian Church of *England*."

Several things hinder'd him from subscribing to this, some of which he mentions. I will set down one, it being evidently a falshood, and accordingly the Church has now alter'd it; but that alone, while it remain'd, was enough to convince them of unconscionableness in requiring a subscription to it. These then are his words: "On Christmas-Day we say: *Thou hast given us thy Son, "this day, to be born of a Virgin.* The same words we use

" all the week after; as if Christ on every day had been " born anew. If we will say, this is but a trifle; the " lighter you make of it, the lother I am to write, that it " is according to the Word of God, or agreeing with it."

4. " I acknowledge, that as the public preaching of " the word, in this Church of *England*, is sound and " sincere; so the public order, in the ministration of the " Sacraments, is consonant to the Word of God."

There is a pleasantness in his exceptions to this Article, but yet such a strength, that I defy all his adversaries to answer him. " For the first part, *says he*, that " all preaching in *England* is sound and sincere, how can " I tell, when I hear not all Preachers? And sometimes " those, that I do hear, preach neither sincere, nor so- " berly: But this is the fault of man; for liberty in this " behalf (God be thanked) we have it; and I humbly " confess, the Preachers of this Church may preach the " truth with boldness."

Against the second part of the Article, the administration of Sacraments, he objects the order for women to baptize, the questions and Cross in Baptism, and lastly he says: " The Wafer-cake in many Churches, is " thought intolerable; and our own Act of Parliament, " for avoiding of superstition, hath appointed other " bread: And what then, if I should mislike of it?" He adds: " Another cause why I cannot simply subscribe: " In this Article and the first are direct contraries. In " the first Article I must subscribe to all the Homilies; " in this to all the ceremonies; and yet our own Homi- " lies condemn many of our ceremonies." Here he alledges the words of the Book of *Homilies:* " That the " costly and manifold furniture of vestments, lately used " in the Church, is *Jewish*, and maketh us the more " willingly (in such apparel of Christians) to become " *Jewish*.——In another Homily 'tis said of piping, " singing, chaunting, playing upon Organs, *&c.* that " they greatly displease God, and filthily defile his holy " Church."

This good man could not subscribe contradictions: but the sticking at that being a piece of needless preciseness, the Bishops thought fit to persecute him.

The other person, mention'd by Mr. *Strype*, is Mr. *Robert Johnson*, Domestic Chaplain to the Lord Keeper *Bacon*; who, when he was requir'd to subscribe, refus'd, and

and was suspended. Mr. *Strype* represents him as a false accuser of the Provost of his College; and as afterwards, in the year 1609, reviling the Puritans in a Sermon he preach'd and printed. But there seems to have been two persons of that name: for I find this remark added, at the end of an account of his trial at *Westminster Hall*, 20 *Febr.* 1573: that he died a prisoner in the *Gatehouse* at *Westminster*, very shortly after, being in great necessity. He was tried for marrying without the Ring, which he says he did for some time; but upon a complaint made against him, he took up the use of it again. Another part of his indictment was, that he omitted the sign of the Cross. To which he answers, owning, he had indeed done so: "But, *says he*, not upon contempt: but "seeing that I have already sustain'd seven weeks im-"prisonment, with the loss of my place and living, I "beseech you be indifferent judges, whether this be not "a sufficient punishment for so small a trespass." But his chief crime was, that there happening to be too little Wine, when he was administring the Sacrament, he sent for more, and reckon'd his first consecration was sufficient for what was afterward applied to the same use. The thing is disputable, whether he did well or no; but sure he deserv'd not to be indicted for it, and to be treated on his trial with so much bitterness, as he was, by the Bishop of *London*, Dr. *Sandys*, and other ecclesiastical persons.

Dr. *Nichols*, in the next place, gives us an account of *The Admonition to the Parliament*, of which he makes Mr. *Cartwright* the author. By the Book it self it appears, several were concern'd in it; but it does not appear *Cartwright* was one of them, and Mr. *Clark* denies it. The Doctor says: *It was a Pamphlet fill'd with abominable reproaches upon the Bishops, and with extraordinary encomiums upon Mr.* Calvin's *platform of Church discipline: which government he desires may be by law establish'd.** The stile of the *Admonition* was indeed somewhat sharp and severe; but then it must be consider'd, what provocation had been given before. The Bishops had, for five or six years, (as it is hinted in the Preface to the first Part) MDLXXII.

* *p.* 27.

been perſecuting poor Miniſters for diſcharging their conſciences; and let the expreſſions us'd be ever ſo hard, yet they are nothing, if compar'd with what the Miniſters had endur'd: and beſides, the corruptions they ſpake againſt were ſo very great, that ſome ſeverity in expoſing them was no more than they deſerv'd: and the Biſhops themſelves had ſet them an example, having before uſed them with the coarſeſt language, as I have already ſhewn from a Treatiſe publiſh'd by their direction, and compos'd, as Mr. *Strype* thinks, by Archbiſhop *Parker* himſelf. But however, it is not decent in the Doctor to object againſt ſuch a ſtile; when he has himſelf pleaded in defence of the uſe of it. Let him but imagine the writers on our ſide to aſſume his words, and he will not be able to deny them to be a ſufficient vindication: "There remains one thing, which we would deſire of "our Brethren, *viz.* That whatever we have already "ſaid, or ſhall hereafter ſay, with freedom, they would "not think we are led thereunto by ill nature, or any "malicious deſign againſt them: for we do moſt ſolemnly "aſſure them, that we do not bring againſt them the "hand of an enemy, but that of a phyſician; and that "we have not touch'd theſe wounds of the Church to "the quick, with any other view, but only for fear that "not being well healed, they ſhould again break out." Which Apology I deſire may be accepted, with reference to all the freedom I make uſe of, thro' this my Anſwer to the Doctor. I can't tell, why he ſhould be offended with the authors of the *Admonition*, for their *extraordinary encomiums* of that *platform*, which, they were perſwaded, was agreeable to the Scriptures. 'Tis very true, as the Doctor obſerves: The authors of the *Admonition deſir'd*, the *government* they deſcrib'd *might be by law eſtabliſh'd*. This, I think, was the greateſt fault in the Book, or in any of the attempts they made. With unanſwerable evidence they expos'd the corruptions of the Eſtabliſh'd eccleſiaſtical Government, and particularly the perſecution and tyranny, by which it was upheld. But I fear, could they have obtain'd their deſire of the Parliament, the *platform* they propos'd muſt have been eſtabliſh'd by ſome perſecuting laws; which I can never find Chriſt appointed his Miniſters to make uſe of, in the advancement of his kingdom. Their diſcipline, had it been eſtabliſh'd, would, I doubt not, have been more ſerviceable to religion,

gion, and less tyrannical than the Episcopal scheme; but that it would have been settled upon a right foot, I can not believe: for I think, all compulsion, and all enforcing of ecclesiastical discipline, by civil penalties, is quite contrary to the spirit of Christianity.

But the Parliament give this arrogant Petition such a treatment, as it deserv'd; and that they might not be troubled with such insolent Addresses any more, they order the introducers of it to be taken into custody.

Our enemies are commonly very partial in their judgments: they will not pass the same sentence upon those, who oppos'd the superstitious corruptions in King *Henry*'s time: and why was it not as lawful to oppose those in Queen *Elizabeth*'s? They did not like the severe proceedings against their own Bishops, in King *James* the Second's reign, for addressing their Prince: and why should they be offended with what was done by the Puritans, who appeal'd to the highest Court of Parliament, from the lower of the Bishops and Commissioners; because they found no equity at their hands, as they express themselves? I cannot think our Adversaries are consistent with themselves. If persecution is lawful and commendable, why do they disclaim it, and pretend 'tis contrary to their principles? If it be lawful, why do they commend the persecuting practices of their predecessors?

But this severity was so far from giving a check to the fierceness of their spirits; that it did the rather irritate them, and was the occasion of their presenting A second Admonition *to the Parliament: and in this they do not bespeak their favour, as in the first, by intreaties; but they perfectly insult them by threats and reproaches: they plainly tell them,* "*That the State did not shew itself upright, alledge* "*the Parliament what it will, &c.*" This is not a fair citation. I will set down the passage a little more largely; by which the reader will see, the Doctor has changed a conditional expression to an absolute one: "The mat-"ters, *says they*, contain'd in the *Admonition*, how true "soever they be, have found small favour: the persons, "that are thought to have made them, are laid in no "worse prison than *Newgate*: the men that set upon "them are no worse than the Bishops: the name, that "goeth of them, is no better than rebels; and great "words there are, that their danger will yet prove greater. Well, whatsoever is said or done against the-

" or whoſoever ſpeak or work againſt them, that is " not the matter; but the equity of their cauſe is the " matter: and yet this I will ſay, *That the ſtate ſheweth* " *not itſelf upright, if it ſuffer them to be moleſted for* " *that, which was ſpoken only by way of Admonition to the* " *Parliament:* which was to conſider of any ſuch Ad- " monition, and to receive it, or reject it, without " farther matter to the authors; except it contain'd ſome " wilful maintenance of manifeſt rebellion, or treaſon, " which it cannot be prov'd to do." The two next paſſages are in like manner expreſs'd in the Book itſelf: That in caſe the Parliament did not deal juſtly and righteouſly, and eſpecially in ſuch a cauſe as this, the ſoreſt vengeance was to be expected. And as to the laſt expreſſion, take it even in the Doctor's words, I can't imagine how any man can find fault with it.

In theſe *Admonitions* were printed Letters from *Beza*, and *Gualter*, in our favour; which Mr. *Strype* repreſents as obtain'd by falſe reports; but is ſo prudent, as not to mention wherein their reports were falſe.* And indeed, 'twould have been ſtrange, if the Miniſters ſhould have had an occaſion to amuſe thoſe Divines with falſe reports of the Biſhops and their perſecution, when the plain truth was too bad in all conſcience.

Theſe *Admonitions* begat a new controverſy between *Cartwright* and *Whitgift*. The latter pretended to anſwer them; whereupon the Miniſters conſulted about an Anſwer; and *Cartwright*, by lot, was appointed to undertake it. His Anſwer came out very ſoon, and was commended by ſuch as were adverſaries to the cauſe he pleaded. Hereupon *Whitgift* wrote a *Defence* of his *Anſwer*. And in that, as a compleat intire victory, not only Dr. *Heylyn* triumphs, pretending *Cartwright* never dar'd to write againſt †; but Dr. *Fuller*, a more moderate writer, ſpends many conjectures upon the reaſon of his ſilence: ‖ whereas he really anſwer'd him largely, in two conſiderable Volumes; the former printed in 1575, the other in 1577. And which is ſtrange, both theſe Doctors cite *Cartwright*'s laſt Anſwer; *Fuller* in the Page before and *Heylyn* about three Pages after, they give this account.

This

* Park. Life, *p.* 348. † Hiſtor. Presbyt. *p.* 238. ‖ Book 9. *p.* 103.

This year the Parliament sat, and the House of Commons took the state of religion into consideration; and brought in two Bills, relating to that affair. One was concerning *Rites and Ceremonies*. "In one of these Bills several of the xxxix Articles were rejected, and complaint "seems to have been made of the indicting, and hard usage "of many godly Preachers, when, on the other hand, Papists had encouragement."* When some of the Members conser'd with the Abp. he signified his dislike, because "the ordinary course of redressing matters amiss did properly belong to the Bishops in Convocation." But what a miserable case must our poor nation be in after this rate? The Convocation is seldom at leisure to reform any thing amiss; and must the Parliament be so complaisant as to wait till they are willing? But why might not the Parliament undertake this matter? All the laws about religion were of their making: and if they found any mischief and inconvenience follow'd any of them, was it not their business to alter them? Farther, when the Abp. ask'd them; Why they left out the Articles concerning the *Homilies*, the *Consecration of Bishops*, and some others: and was answered; Because they had not time to examine how they agreed with the Word of God: the Abp. replied; *Surely you mistook the matter. You will refer your selves wholly to us therein.* Mr. *Strype* is offended at the Answer made to this of the Abp: That they would pass nothing, before they understood what it was: that to do so would be to *make them Popes*. But is not the thing plain? What can any *Pope* in the world do more, than require an implicit faith, and persecute men for want of it? Here was now a fair opportunity for the Bishops to have attempted a Reformation, according as they had promis'd; but they were warm in their nests, and neither regarded the consciences, nor sufferings of their Brethren. And 'tis not unlikely they might have a hand in putting a stop to these good proceedings of the Parliament. For the Queen, according to her arbitrary manner, sent and forbad their meddling with these matters. So that our Reformation, after all the boastings about it, was mostly model'd according to the pleasure of a woman; of whose character for religion I have had occasion to say somewhat already.

* Park, Life *p.* 394.

Mr. *Strype*'s account of the ſtate of religion at this time is very remarkable: "The Churchmen heap'd up many "Benefices upon themſelves, and reſided upon none, ne-"glecting their Cures; many of them alienated their "lands, made unreaſonable leaſes, and waſtes of their "woods; granted reverſions and advowſons to their wives "and children, or to others for their uſe. Churches ran "greatly into dilapidations and decays; and where kept na-"ſty, and filthy, and undecent for God's worſhip. A-"mong the laity there was little devotion. The Lord's "Day greatly profan'd, and little obſerv'd. The common "prayers not frequented. Some lived without any ſervice of "God at all. Many were mere heathens and atheiſts. The "Queen's own court an harbour for *Epicures* and *atheiſts*, "and a kind of lawleſs peace, becauſe it ſtood in no pa-"riſh."* I do not wonder therefore, if ſuch good men as the Puritans were, ſuffer'd grievouſly at the hands of ſuch an ungodly generation.

MDLXXIII. This year the perſecution was hotter againſt the Puritans, than ever it had been before. Several eminent Miniſters were brought before the Council, and ſeveral before the Eccleſiaſtical Commiſſion. By the Articles propounded to ſome of them, they were examin'd: whether the Book of Service was good and godly, *every tittle* grounded on Holy Scripture? Whether the xxxix Articles were agreeable to the Word of God, or not? Whether we muſt of neceſſity follow the primitive Church in ſuch things, as are uſed and eſtabliſh'd, or not? And whether all Miniſters ſhould be equal? And ſurely they had a wonderful opinion of their *Service Book*, that there was not *a little* amiſs in it. One would think they ſhould have left this honour to the Holy Scriptures, and only to the originals of them. But what will not a perſecuting ſpirit hurry men to? Againſt one of the perſecuted Miniſters, Mr. *Deringe*, 'twas objected: That he ſpake againſt the deſcent of Chriſt into hell; againſt Miniſters who did not preach; and for the right of people to elect their Miniſters. Several of the Miniſters were caſt into priſon, and ſo inhuman were the Eccleſiaſtical Commiſſioners, that they made an inquiry who were the perſons, who viſited them in their affliction; tho' the comfort

* Park Life, *p.* 395.

fort of their friends visits does not use to be denied to thieves, murderers, and such like vile malefactors. Several of the Ministers were threaten'd with banishment, unless they would agree to their religion. The Archbishop prompted the Privy Council and the Queen to severity against them. And two severe Proclamations were publish'd against the Puritans, and one of them particularly against their Books. For notwithstanding *Whitgift*'s endeavours, this course was thought the most effectual confutation. The violence and fury of the Bishops did but render them odious, and the Ministers the more belov'd in the city. This greatly mov'd their envy and malice, insomuch that *Sands*, Bp. of *London*, advis'd: "That the chief authors "of this sedition [as he was pleas'd to call it] who were "now esteem'd as gods, should be remov'd far from the "city. If these idols, said he, who are honour'd for "saints, and greatly enrich'd with gifts, were remov'd "from hence, their honour would fall into the dust; "they would be taken for blocks, as they are." *

This was fine language from a Bishop concerning his Brethren, for whom he once profess'd a great esteem. Afterwards he cries out to the Lord Treasurer, and other Lords, to put to their helping hand; telling them, that as for himself, "He was too weak: yea if all of his calling "were join'd together, they were too weak: their esti-"mation was little, their authority less: they were be-"come contemptible in the eyes of the basest sort of people. And may that always be the reward of persecutors.

Mr. *Dering*, a Minister who had a Lecture at *Paul*'s, † was forbid reading there; but he procur'd a Letter from the Council to restore him, as he told the Bp. of *London*. Mr. *Strype* says the Council gave him no Letters, and so in effect charges him with a falsehood. But he has been so kind as fully to clear him within a few Pages after, by an attestation under the hands of the Abp. and Bp. of *London*: "We have sent unto you certain Articles, taken out of "*Cartwright*'s Book by the Council, propounded unto "*Dering*, with his Answers to the same; and also *a Copy* "*of the Council's Letter, writ to Mr.* Dering, *to restore him* "*to his former reading and preaching*, his answer notwith-"standing, our advices never requir'd thereunto. These "pro-

* Park. Life, *p.* 428. † Park Life, *p.* 422.

" proceedings puff them up with pride, make the people " hate us, and magnify them with great triumphings. " *

I shall now return to Dr. *Nichols*, and consider what he says concerning this year. And the first thing he complains of it: *That* Cartwright, *joining with him some of his Puritan friends, openly begins a separation from the Establish'd Church. And now under his direction a Puritanical Class is set up at* Wandsworth, *near* London; *and others were erected at* Northampton, Daventry *and* Kettering *in* Northamptonshire: *and several others in* Warwickshire, Suffolk, *and in other counties of the kingdom.*

The Puritans had long made their complaints and testified against the establish'd corruptions, and pleaded for a more thorough Reformation; and if, upon finding there was no hope they should persuade the government to undertake the work, they made an attempt themselves, who can blame them? Our Author, in his *Latin* Treatise, taxes this with Schism. And we can freely return him his complement; being well assur'd, that to separate from Schismatics is no Schism; and especially when they turn furious persecutors. If the Puritans were in any fault in this matter, it should rather seem to me to be, that they were so backward to leave those men, who were very forward and zealous to drive them out. The Church pretends once a year to make a complaint of her want of *a godly discipline*. And where was the hurt, if these men attempted to set up such an one?

Those Ministers of the separation, who had no Benefices, kept Conventicles in private houses, or in the fields. And therein they imitated the primitive Christians, as our Adversaries do their persecutors, who express'd their contempt of their assemblies, by bestowing the same name of *Conventicles* upon them. *Others who were the parish Ministers, reserv'd the office of preaching to themselves; but for reading the Common Prayer, they hired some sorry person, of the meanest of the laity, to perform it. Mr.* Snape, *Minister at* Warwick, *a great Puritan of that time, and Mr.* Cartwright's *particular confident, did transgress all rules of modesty in this particular, and hired a lame old Soldier to be his Reader.* It is not fair from a single instance, if true, to advance a general charge; as our Author here does, against a whole party. What Mr.

* *P.* 433.

Mr. *Snape* did might be no common practice. But the case is this: In the Foreign Churches, as likewise in some of the Conformists Churches, 'tis common for the Clerk to read the Scriptures. This is all I can guess was done by the Soldier, ordinarily in the assembly; nor can it be thought to be done out of contempt: unless it be imagin'd, that Mr. *Snape* design'd to treat the Holy Scriptures with contempt; which I never heard any one pretend to charge upon the Puritans. There is not the least mention made by our Author's voucher, of the Soldier's reading any part of the ordinary service of the Liturgy. He was order'd indeed to read the *Office for Matrimony*, but that was not to contemn it; but because *Snape* held, "That duty to "appertain no more to the Minister's office, than to any "other man." But what greater evil was there in *Snape*'s imploying a Soldier, had it been to do all our Author suggests; than there was in Bishop *Aylmer*'s ordaining his old Porter, and not only allowing him to read the Church service, but bestowing a living upon him also?

The Puritans having set upon this work, and being more afraid of the Bishops temporal power than their arguments, acted, as our Author suggests, with a great deal of privacy; which all, who are impartial, must own to have been prudently done by them.

After this they proceeded with all the solemnity of a legal council, making Canons and injunctions, to be observ'd by all their followers. If our Author had set down what these Canons and injunctions were, every one would have been able to discern, that they are not like those of 1603, which denounce a great many excommunications against persons, who are far from deserving them. Indeed their Canons (as our Author calls them) are no other, but the resolutions they form'd concerning their duty, upon the most serious deliberation. They did not pretend to make any thing a sin or duty, which the Scripture did not make so. *Supported by this authority, the Puritan Ministers take upon them, judicially to animadvert upon any faults, committed by any of their Congregation, and to excommunicate and forbid the use of the sacraments and publick worship.* The authority by which they were supported, was that which Christ has given to his Ministers, whom he has plac'd as rulers in his Church; which is an authority much better, than the civil magistrate is able to bestow. And one would think, here could be nothing, that any man should be

able

able to look upon as criminal. Our Author ſuppoſes perſons to be really guilty of *faults*; and why ſhould not their *faults be animadverted upon* according to their deſert? This certainly is juſt matter of praiſe, rather that reproach. And 'twould have much better become our Author, to have lamented the utmoſt loſs of diſcipline in his own Church; than to upbraid the Puritans with reviving and reſtoring it among themſelves.

MDLXXVI. The perſecution of the Puritans ſtill went on, tho' their great enemy, Archbiſhop *Parker*, was dead. *Grindal*, his ſucceſſor, had too much a hand in giving them diſturbance, and ſtirring up the Queen's anger againſt them, while they endeavour'd to diſcharge their duty with a good conſcience. And now this year he had a taſt of that hard uſage himſelf, which his Brethren had met with from him: for he fell very much into the Queen's diſpleaſure, upon the account of his encouraging a ſort of exerciſes, which were than call'd *Prophecyings*. Of theſe I ſhall here give a ſhort account. The firſt mention I find of them is in the year 1571: "When "they were ſet up at *Northampton*, with the conſent "of *Scambler*, the Biſhop of the Dioceſs, the Mayor "and his Brethren, and other the Queen's Juſtices of "the peace within that county and town. In theſe "exerciſes, certain of the Miniſters, who were appointed, (diſcourſing orderly one after another) handled "ſome Text (given, as it ſeems, by the Biſhop) opening the ſame briefly and plainly to the people. The "firſt, that ſpake, began and ended with Prayer: His "province was to explain the Text he read, and to confute any falſe and unſound expoſitions thereof: then "to give the comfort to the audience, that the place "miniſtred juſt occaſion of. He, or they, who ſpake "after, had liberty to touch at what the firſt ſpeaker "omitted: the exerciſe not to exceed two hours: one "of the moderators always to make the concluſion. After the exerciſe was ended, the Preſident call'd the "Brethren to him, and requir'd their judgment, concerning the expoſition of the Scripture, that had been "given: and if any matter had been untouch'd, then "to be declar'd: and if any of the ſpeakers were infam'd, or convicted of any grievous crime, he was "then and there reprehended. After the conſultation,

"any

" any of the Brethren might propound their doubts, to " have them satisfied the next exercise. The consulta- " tion was ended with a short exhortation, to move each " one to go forward in his holy office, to apply his " study, and to increase in godliness. Then the next " speaker was nominated publicly, and the Text he " should expound, read." * The usefulness of these exercises was very great. Slothful Ministers were shamed out of their idleness: the elder Ministers were made more solicitous to excel in knowledge and virtue, as well as in age: the younger were, by good counsels and examples, taught to instruct their respective congregations. And in short, they were all the better for their mutual helps.

These exercises were set up in *Norfolk*, and several other places; but Archbishop *Parker* was very much offended at them, and sent his Archiepiscopal commands to the Bishops to suppress them. But when the Privy Council, on the other hand, wrote in their favour, *Parker* made his application to the Queen, and got her order for the suppressing of them; and then triumph'd over the Bishop of *Norwich* in his great atchievement.

The opposition *Parker* made against these exercises, was really unaccountable; for there was nothing then done in them, that in the least interfered with his darling Conformity. But that dislike, to which he wrought the Queen of these exercises, never wore off. When *Grindal* succeeded, and complaints were made of some abuses in these exercises, he drew up orders for reforming them. But he might have sav'd himself the trouble: " For the Queen did not like, the laity should neglect " their secular affairs, by repairing to these meetings: " which she thought also might fill their heads with no- " tions, and so occasion dissentions, and unquiet dis- " putes; and, it may be, seditious in the state. And " the Archbishop being at court, she particularly de- " clar'd herself offended at the numbers of Preachers, as " well as at the exercises, and warn'd him to redress " both: urging, that it was good for the Church to " have few Preachers, and that three or four might " suffice for a county; and that the reading of the Ho- " milies to the people was enough. The speeches she " used

* Grind. Life, *p.* 175, 176.

" uſed to him were ſomewhat ſharp; and ſhe was very " reſolute to have no more exerciſes of this ſort, and " cared not for any great encreaſe of Preachers; but " that the licenſes for preaching ſhould be more ſparingly " granted out; and ſhe expected the Archbiſhop ſhould " give eſpecial orders for both." * Upon this occaſion, *Grindal* wrote her a very modeſt and humble, but a moſt convincing and moving Letter; † wherein he vindicated theſe exerciſes, and ſhew'd the great advantage of them, both to religion and the civil government: and he adds this frank and noble declaration: " And as for my own " part, becauſe I am very well aſſur'd, both by reaſons " and arguments taken out of the Holy Scriptures, and " by experience (the moſt certain ſeal of ſure know- " ledge) that the ſaid exerciſes, for the interpretation " and expoſition of the Scriptures, and for exhortation " and comfort drawn out of the ſame, are both pro- " fitable to increaſe knowledge among the Miniſters, and " tendeth to the edifying of the hearers; I am forced " with all humility, and yet plainly, to profeſs, that I " cannot with ſafe conſcience, and without the offence " of the Majeſty of God, give my aſſent to the ſup- " preſſing of the ſaid exerciſes: much leſs can I ſend " out any injunction for the utter and univerſal ſubver- " ſion of the ſame." ‖ He earneſtly exhorts her too, that when ſhe dealt in matters of faith and religion, or that touch the Church of Chriſt, ſhe would not pronounce ſo reſolutely, and peremptorily, upon her own authority, as ſhe might in civil matters; but remember the will of God, and not of any earthly creature, was herein to take place. He puts her in mind: That 'tis the Antichriſtian voice of the Pope: *Sic volo, ſic jubeo*, &c. *So I will have it, ſo I command:* let my will ſtand for a reaſon. In God's matters, all Princes ought to bow their ſcepters to the Son of God, and to ask counſel at his mouth, what they ought to do.

Theſe exerciſes were approv'd and promoted by many of the Biſhops, encourag'd by King *James* in *Scotland*: to whom my Lord *Bacon* recommended the reviving them, after he became King of *Great Britain*.

It

* Grindal's Life, *p.* 221. † *See the Letter in* Strype's Life of Grindal, *App. p.* 74. ‖ Ibid. *p.* 82.

It must be own'd, the writing this Letter was one of the noblest acts of *Grindal*'s life, if he had but kept more stifly to it. The Queen would not be mov'd by all he could say, and in some few months after sent her own Letter to the Bishops, whereby she requir'd them to put down these exercises: and her resentment ran so high against the Archbishop, that he was confin'd to his house, and sequestred for six months. The Lord Treasurer sent to the Archbishop, directing him in what manner he should make his submission; which he for the present refus'd, because he did not think himself to have committed any fault; and therefore he would not own himself in any, in a submissive Letter, which he wrote to the Lords of the Privy Council in the *Star Chamber*. His sequestration therefore continued, and there was some design of degrading him. But at last, in the year 1582, he made his submission; wherein he insists upon it indeed, that what he did was, because he was mov'd in conscience to it; yet however he says, That "understanding that her Majesty therein, "[the forbidding those exercises] did use the advice "and allowance of certain Bishops, his Brethren, who "by likelihood certified, that they in their own Dio-"ceses found the same more hurtful than profitable; "in, and for that, he is perswaded, that her Majesty "had herein a *sincere and godly meaning* to the quiet-"ness of her people: and that also her commandment "was not against positive law, or constitution of the "realm, he cannot but *speak honourably and dutifully of* "*her Majesty's doings*, as of a *godly Prince, meaning well* "of the Church and her people, in *this* her Majesty's "direction and commandment. And as he is most hear-"tily sorry, that he hath incur'd her Majesty's grie-"vous offence, for not observing that her command-"ment; so doth he most humbly and lowly beseech "her Highness not to impute the same to any obstinate "intent, meaning to disobey her Majesty; but only "that he was *then* moved in conscience to be an hum-"ble suiter to her Majesty, to be spar'd from being the "special instrument in suppressing the said exercises. "And to the intent her Majesty may think that he meant "no disobedience, in any maintenance of them to con-"tinue contrary to her commandment, he doth pray her "Majesty to be truly inform'd, how *he himself did, in*

"*his*

" *his own Biſhoprick, and other peculiar juriſdictions, ſuf-*
" *fer no ſuch exerciſes to be uſed,* after the time of
" her Majeſty's ſaid commandment." * So that I do not ſee, that Mr. *Strype* had ſufficient ground to commend him, as he does, upon this occaſion; for *being endued with an immutable conſtancy of mind, in perſiſting in a thing that he reckon'd his duty.* † Nor is it true, that he ſays elſewhere: *That he would never be brought to give forth his orders, for the putting theſe exerciſes down.* ‖ 'Tis true, he would never ſend his order to the other Biſhops; but 'tis plain, by his ſubmiſſion, he gave out ſuch orders for his own Dioceſs. And I would fain know, how it could be lawful for him to ſuppreſs them himſelf; if it was unlawful for him to ſend to the other Biſhops to do it? If the ſuppreſſing them was evil, it was unlawful for him to do it; if it was not, he might have ſent to his Brethren to do it too. This ſhould be a warning to men, to beware how they attempt to force men upon any thing contrary to their conſciences; ſince 'tis a righteous thing with God to ſuffer others to deal with them in the ſame manner; and he ſometimes does ſo, as we ſee in this inſtance of the Archbiſhop, to his great vexation and diſquietment.

'Tis eaſy to imagine, the perſecution raged furiouſly, when the Queen ſhewed herſelf in ſuch a temper. Many good men were now in diſtreſs, and while abundance of complaints were made of the vaſt increaſe of Papiſts; yet little encouragement could be allow'd to ſuch Miniſters, who would have zealouſly oppos'd them.

Mr. *Richard Gawton*, or *Gayton*, was now ſuſpended for his Nonconformity. He was Miniſter of *Snoring*; but Archbiſhop *Parker*, after he was preſented to it, forc'd him to ſign an obligation of 100 Marks, to pay Dr. *Willoughby* (who had thro' meer careleſneſs loſt the living) 14 *l.* a year. ‡ If he had not done it, he muſt have gone to priſon; which was a barbarous and tyrannical act of the Archbiſhop; and the poor man was ſo cramp'd with paying this annuity, that he was glad to quit the living.

About

---

* *See his Life, p.* 272. † *P.* 300. ‖ *P.* 296. ‡ *Part of a Regiſter, p.* 393. *Comp.* Parker's Life, *p.* 373.

About this time fell out also the troubles of Mr. *Richard Greenham*, Minister in *Drayton* near *Cambridge*, a man of a most excellent spirit; and who, tho' he would not subscribe, or conform to the habits, yet avoided speaking of these matters, that he might not give offence: and whoever will read his Letter to the Bishop of *Ely*, will wonder what sort of men they could be, that would bear hard upon such a Minister.

Dr. *John Aylmer* was this year, 1576, made Bishop of *London*, a man of a most intemperate heat, who persecuted the Puritans with the utmost rage, and treated Ministers with such virulent and abusive language, as a man of sense and indifferent temper, would scorn to use towards porters and coblers. I think it worth while to transcribe a part of his examination of a poor Minister, that it may be seen how this Bishop behav'd himself upon the bench.* This Minister's name was *Merbury*; and upon the Bishop's urging him earnestly to tell what he had to say against him, or the Bishop of *Peterborough*, he answer'd him thus:

" *M.* I come not to accuse, but to defend; but be-
" cause you urge me for advantage, I say, that the
" Bishops of *London* and *Peterborough*, and all the Bish-
" ops in *England*, are guilty of the death of as many
" souls, as have perished by the ignorance of the Mi-
" nisters of their making, *whom they knew to be unable.*

" *B.* Whom such have I made?

" *M.* I accuse you not particularly, because I know
" not your estate; if you have, you shall bear this con-
" demnation.

" *B.* Thy proposition is false; if it were in *Cambridge*
" it would be hissed out of the Schools.

" *M.* Then you had need to hire hissers.

" *B.* If I, finding one well qualified with learning,
" admit him, and he after play the trewant, and become
" ignorant, and by his ignorance slay souls, am I guilty
" of their death?

" *M.* This is another question. I distinguish: I speak
" of them, which were never able.

" *B.* Distinguish? Thou knowest not a distinction:
" What is a distinction?

L " *M.* 'Tis

* *Part of a Regist. p.* 382

" *M.* 'Tis a ſevering of things which ſeem to be the " ſame.

" *B.* Nay that is *differentia.*

" *M. Differunt, quæ non ſunt ambigua*; but we di- " tinguiſh thoſe things only, which are *ambigua*: as you " differ not from the Biſhop of *London*, but I may " diſtinguiſh between you and the Biſhop of *London*; " becauſe you remain a man without the Biſhoprick.

" *B.* Here's a tale of a tub. How many *Predicaments* " are there?

" *M.* I anſwer you according to your queſtion, if I " ſay there are enow of ſeven: for why do you ask " me queſtions ſo impertinent?

" *B.* How many *Predicables* be there? Where didſt " thou learn thy Logic?

" *M.* The laſt time you ſpake much of τὸ πρέπον: but " this is τὸ παράδοξον. I am no Logician.

" Thou ſpeakeſt of making Miniſters: the Biſhop of " *Peterborough* was never more overſeen in his life, " than when he admitted thee to be a preacher in " *Northampton.*

" *M.* Like enough ſo, (in ſome ſenſe) I pray God " theſe ſcales may fall from his eyes.

" *B.* Thou art a very aſs; thou art mad; thou art " couragious; nay, thou art impudent: by my troth, " I think he is mad; he careth for no body.

" *M.* Sir, I take exception at ſwearing judges: I " praiſe God, I am not mad, but ſorry to ſee you ſo out " of temper.

" *B.* Did you ever hear one more impudent?

" *M.* 'Tis not, I truſt, impudence to anſwer for my " ſelf.

" *B.* Nay, I know thou art couragious, thou art " fool hardy.

" *M.* Tho' I fear not you, I fear the Lord.

" *Recorder of London.* Is he learned?

" *B.* Learned? He hath an arrogant ſpirit: he can " ſcarce conſtrue *Cato*, I think.

" *M.* Sir, you do not puniſh me, becauſe I am un- " learned. Howbeit, I underſtand both the *Greek* and " *Latin* tongues; aſſay me to approve your diſgrace.

" *B.* Thou takeſt upon thee to be a Preacher, but " there is nothing in thee: thou art a very aſs, an ideot, " and a fool.

" *M.*

" *M.* I humbly beſeech you, Sir, have patience, give " this people better example: I am that I am, thro' " the Lord: I ſubmit the trial of my ſufficiency to the " judgment of the learned; but this wandering ſpeech " is not logical.

This is the Biſhop whom Mr. *Strype* commends, as an *exact Logician.** How juſtly the reader may judge by this *ſpecimen.* How fine was ſuch language out of the mouth of a Chriſtian, a Magiſtrate, and a Biſhop! There is a great deal more worth reading in that examination. Particularly one thing is remarkable, that he inſults poor *Merbury*, becauſe he was for having a Miniſter in every pariſh. At parting, he gives him the civil ſalutation of an *overthwart proud Puritan knave*, and ſent him to the *Marſhalſea*, tho' he had been twice in priſon before. This man devis'd the employing Apparitors, as ſpies, to go about on the Lord's days, and ſee what Conformity was uſed in every pariſh, and to certify accordingly. † And very ſtrict he was in enquiring, whether any did not uſe the Surplice, or alter the ſervice, and particularly the rites in Baptiſm.

One of his Articles related to contentious Preachers, who ſcandalouſly gave others the name of *dumb dogs.* This name, which the Scripture gives to ſuch Miniſters, as diſcharge not their office, *Iſa.* lvi. 10. was very much reſented by the Biſhop, when the Puritans applied that Text to unpreaching Miniſters; but aſs, ideot, fool, knave, were terms which the Biſhop could freely uſe himſelf, as appears by what I have ſet down already.

Another of his injunctions was: " No invectives to " be uſed of, or againſt, Eſtates: " ‖ that is, ſays Mr. *Strype*, This, or other kingdoms, or potentates; ſome preachers, as it ſeems, being now a-days very liberal in their ſpeeches, both againſt *France* and *Spain.* And yet he himſelf practis'd quite otherwiſe; as Mr. *Strype* has ſet down his moſt bitter invective againſt *Henry* the *French* King: " He, a King, or a Devil; " a Chriſtian, or a Luciſer? —— Oh! wicked caitiff, " and firebrand of hell." ‡ Had a Preacher utter'd ſuch words, he would have been proſecuted by this Biſhop, but his dignity privileged him above other mortals,

* Aylm. Life, *p.* 240. † Ibid *p.* 93. 202. ‖ *p.* 82. ‡ *p* 279

to say what he pleas'd. He was pleas'd to say of these his injunctions and enquiries, when he gave them forth in his Consistory; that he would surely and severely punish the offenders in these points, or *he would lie in the dust for it.** And that his cruelties sufficiently expos'd him, we may learn from what he afterwards said himself: "That he was hated like a dog, and was call'd, *The "oppressor of the children of God.*" † And not without good reason: for he made nothing of flinging men into prison, and keeping them there to ruin them.

MDLXXXII. And when *Whitgift* was made Archbishop, the sufferings, which good men indur'd for the sake of their consciences, became intolerable.

The Ministers in *Kent* being grievously harrass'd this year by *Whitgift*, for not subscribing to Articles, devis'd by himself, presented a Petition to the Privy Council. And at the same time came up a great many other Petitions from several parts of the Kingdom, complaining of their Ministers being turn'd out. The Council therefore wrote to the Archbishop in their behalf; but all was in vain; he only grew the more outragious hereupon, and set up a new method of persecuting among us.

MDLXXXIV. He devis'd therefore twenty four large Articles, or interrogatories, penn'd in the subtil and captious stile of the *Romish* Inquisitions, and commanded Ministers to subscribe to them, *ex mero officio.*

No copy of these Articles was granted them; nor time allowed them to consider before hand of their answer; but they must give it upon the spot. *Burleigh*, the Lord Treasurer, upon the complaint of the Ministers, sent for the Register of *London*, and desir'd to see those Articles; of which he soon after thus gave his opinion, in a Letter to the Archbishop: "The Articles I have read, and "find them so curiously penn'd, so full of branches and "circumstances, that I think the Inquisitions of *Spain* "use not so many questions to comprehend, and intrap "their preys. I knew your Canonists can defend these "with all their particles: but surely, under your Grace's "correction, this juridical and canonical sistner of poor "Ministers, is not to edify and reform. And in cha-"rity, I think, they ought not to answer to all these "nice

* *p.* 83. † *p.* 95.

" nice points, except they were very notorious offenders " in Papistry or Heresy. —— But I conclude, that accord- " ing to my simple judgment, this kind of proceeding is " too much favouring the *Romish* Inquisition, and is ra- " ther a device to seek for offenders, than to reform " any." *

This year was publish'd the *Rhemish Testament*, which they every where endeavour'd to accommodate to the Popish opinions. The learned part of the nation thought a confutation of those opinions was necessary. Nay, and Queen *Elizabeth* seems to have been not a little concern'd about it; who is said to have sent to *Beza*, to request him to undertake the answer. But he modestly excus'd it, and return'd answer, that she had one in her own Kingdom far abler than himself to undertake such a task. Being ask'd, who that person should be, he at length told her, 'twas Mr. *Thomas Cartwright*; the man our Adversaries hated and depos'd, and counted worthy of nothing, but reproaches and inprisonment; tho' *Beza* thought the sun did not see a more learned man. † Soon after, Secretary *Walsingham*, by his Letters, solicited him to undertake the work; and the better to enable him to go thro' with it, sent him an hundred pounds, promising likewise to furnish him with whatever more was necessary. The Queen her self, who placed a great confidence in *Walsingham*, is thought not only to have been acquainted with what he wrote to *Cartwright*, but to have disburs'd the mony he sent him. His Letter to him was soon seconded by another, wrote in the name of *Fulk* and *Whitaker*, and several other of the chief Divines at *Cambridge*, who earnestly intreated him to undertake this work. The Ministers of *London* and *Suffolk* solicited him to the same purpose. *Cartwright*, in compliance with the request of so many eminent persons, and out of a desire of vindicating the truth, set about it diligently: and had made a good progress, by that time Archbishop *Whitgift* got notice of it. He was desperatly nettled, either that his adversary should have so much respect shew'd him, or should have an opportunity (which he knew he would improve) of gaining so honourable a victory;

* Full. Ch. Hist. *lib.* 9. † Clark *in* Cartwright's *life*.

or, that he saw his own learning undervalued, while no body desir'd him to undertake it; or finally, because he apprehended his authority to be neglected, while his leave was not ask'd for his undertaking it. Whatever it was, that moved this Gentleman's choler, 'tis certain he presently sent, and haughtily enough forbad *Cartwright*'s farther proceeding in it. Now I would fain know, how this fell under his Archiepiscopal cognizance and authority? or, what right he had to trouble himself about what Mr. *Cartwright* was writing in his study against the Papists? One may easily guess by this, that when he said to him, as I mention'd before: "You do what you list, "go when you list, come when you list, speak when "you list, at your pleasure: what would you have "more?" we may guess, I say, 'twas a grief of soul to him, he should have so much as that poor liberty, and therefore he took the first opportunity to deprive him of it. A like method of our Adversaries we shall meet with again, in the reign of King *James* II. Who can now forbear wondering at the vain and troublesome humour of the man? What? Was there no need of any answer? All the learned every where unanimously testify'd the contrary. If an answer was needful, why must *Cartwright* be forbidden to meddle with it? Perhaps, the work was too difficult for him to be able to manage it. Whoever thought so, I dare say *Whitgift* did not, who know by experience what *Cartwright*'s abilities were. If *Cartwright* was not to be trusted in such a combate, why did not *Whitgift* himself undertake it? Or if he had less leisure, now he had got his preferment, to write against the Papists, than he had formerly against the Puritans; why did he not himself however appoint some other noble champion, that should be fitter to enter the lists than *Cartwright?* Well, poor *Cartwright*, knowing the authority and wrath of his Grace was much more formidable, than the arguments of all the *Rhemists* put together, laid aside the work: but some years after, encourag'd by an Honourable Lord, he resum'd it, but had not time to perfect it. 'Twas not printed 'till after his own and *Whitgift*'s death, in the year, 1618: the Copy had been neglected, and was mouse eaten in part, which caus'd some defects, when it came to be publish'd. "A Book, (says *Fuller*) "which notwithstanding the foresaid defects, is so com-

"pleat,

" pleat, that the *Rhemists* durst never return the least " answer thereunto." * And in another place thus: " In a word, no *English* champion, in that age, did " with more valour, or success, charge or rout the *Ro-* " *mish* enemy in matters of doctrine." † Which is a noble commendation out of the mouth of an adversary. Some may perhaps think, that Dr. *Fulk* wrote his learned Answer to the *Rhemists*, at the desire of the Archbishop; but 'tis certain he did not: he was one of the *Cambridge* Doctors, who desir'd *Cartwright* to undertake it; and when he saw he had, upon the Archbishop's discouragement, laid aside a work, which he thought absolutely necessary, he undertook it himself. And when he publish'd his Book, he gave his readers notice, they were to expect a much more compleat answer from Mr. *Cartwright*. And indeed there was no great reason, why the Archbishop should commit the work to *Fulk*, rather than to *Cartwright*: *Fulk* was himself a Puritan, and chose to leave the College, and board in a private house in *Cambrige*, rather than wear the Surplice. And Mr. *Strype*, in several places, has occasion to shew he was a Puritan.

This year Mr. *George Giffard*, a learned Minister at *Malden* in *Essex*, was suspended by his Diocesan, Bishop *Aylmer*. He wrote with a great deal of zeal against the *Brownists*, in defence of the Church; tho' he was a Puritan, and scrupled Conformity in several things. " He " was, as Mr. *Strype* says, a great and diligent Preacher, " and much esteem'd by many, and of good rank in the " town; and had brought that place to more sobriety, " and knowledge of true religion." ‡ But those things were poor trifles, while he did not like the ceremonies: and the Archbishop was as bitter against him, as his Diocesan, and would not regard the suit the Lord Treasurer made in his behalf. He was brought before the High Commission, and accus'd of teaching disobedience to magistrates, and several other things. But when his accusers could not prove what they alledg'd against him, but all the charges appear'd to be false, the Bishop, for very shame restor'd him to his preaching, for a little while; for he kept his ears still open to this kind of sycophants,

* *Book* 9. *p.* 171. † *Book* 10. *p.* 3. ‖ Hickm. Apol. *p.* 71. ‡ Aylm. Life, *p.* 110.

whom, one would think, upon such tryal, he should have adhorr'd; and so, upon a new complaint, he suspended him a second time.

The latter end of this year, the House of Commons pass'd a Bill for reforming some things: what they particularly were, and how the Bishops at that time behav'd themselves, may be learnt from Archbishop *Whitgift*'s Letter to the Queen. "They have pass'd, *says he*, a Bill in "that House yesterday, touching the matter [of admitting men to the Ministry] which, besides other great "inconveniences, hath this also, that if it pass by Parliament, it cannot hereafter but in Parliament be alter'd: —— whereas, if it pass but as a Canon from "us, by your Majesty's authority, it may be observ'd or "alter'd at your pleasure." [This was a cunning fetch of the Archbishop, considering the temper of the Queen.] "They have also passed a Bill, giving liberty to marry "at all times of the year, without restraint, contrary "to the old Canons, continually observ'd amongst us; "and containing matter, which tendeth to the slander of "this Church, as having hitherto maintain'd an error." * The watchful Archbishop was very solicitous, that the Church of *England* might be thought as infallible, as that of *Rome*. By this we may perceive, what kind of men we have had to do with; and that their pride and insufferable arrogance has always made them oppose all methods of peace and union: and yet this man himself, before he was made a Bishop, and had tasted the sweet gain that these laws brought in, declar'd himself displeas'd, that men should be forbidden to marry at all times of the year. And what did it signify, that this was *contrary to the old Canons*, if those old Canons were contrary to sense and reason, and were design'd in favour of superstition? But let's hear how he goes on: "There is likewise now in hand, in the same House, a "Bill concerning Ecclesiastical Courts, and Visitations by "Bishops, which may reach to the overthrow of ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and study of the Civil Laws. The "pretence of the Bill is against excessive fees, and exactions, in Ecclesiastical Courts, which fees are none other "than have been of long time accustom'd to be taken; the "law,

* Fuller, *p.* 174.

" law, already eſtabliſh'd, providing a ſharp and ſevere " puniſhment for ſuch, as ſhall exceed the ſame.

The Convocation ſat this year, and the Miniſters drew up their reaſons, why they could not ſubſcribe, as the Biſhops requir'd them, to two of their three Articles, *viz.*

2. " That the Book of Common Prayer, and of or- " daining Biſhops, Prieſts and Deacons, containeth in " it nothing contrary to the Word of God, and that " the ſame may be lawfully uſed: and that I my ſelf, " who do ſubſcribe, will uſe the Form of the ſaid Book " preſcribed, in public Prayer, and adminiſtration of " the Sacraments, and no other."

3. " That I allow the Book of *Articles of Reli-* " *gion*, agreed upon by the Archbiſhops and Biſhops of " both Provinces, and the whole Clergy in the Convo- " cation holden at *London*, in the year of our Lord God, " 1562, and ſet forth by her Majeſty's authority; and " do believe all the Articles, therein contain'd, to be " agreeable to God. In witneſs whereof I have ſubſcrib'd " my name."

Together with their reaſons they preſented a Petition, drawn in the moſt humble and reſpectful ſtile. Herein they earneſtly requeſt them, " To ponder the reaſons that " with held them from ſubſcribing, and ſo to reſolve " them of the point they had ſet down, as that they " might clearly underſtand how with a good conſcience " they might yield unto it; or if they [the Convoca- " tion] ſhould judge either all, or ſome part of that " they [the Miniſters] alledg'd, to be juſt and reaſona- " ble, that then it might pleaſe their wiſdoms to become " favourable means unto her moſt excellent Majeſty, and " the high Court of Parliament, for the Reformation of " ſuch things, as by the Word of God are to be redreſs'd. " Then they appeal to God, that they ſought not to de- " face the Church, nor delighted to diſcover her imper- " fections; but upon ſuch neceſſities and extremities, as " ſome of them had been brought to, and eſpecially " which were indur'd by their poor flocks, where they " had labour'd, which were now left without any preach- " ing Miniſter, they were conſtrain'd modeſtly to lay " open the ſores and wounds thereof, before their Reve- " rend Synod, of whom in all duty and reaſon they " were chiefly to hope to receive ſome comfort and re- " lief; that if there be any *Balm in Gilead, and any*

" *Phy-*

" *Physician in all Israel*, their infected Church, and the " daughter of their people might be healed. In which " respect they desir'd all might be taken in good part, as " it was by them dutifully and charitably meant." This Petition may be seen in *Mr.* Fenner's *Defence of the godly Ministers against* D. Bridges:* where their reasons also are set down at length.† What became of this, take in that author's own words: " After this Petition was pre- " sented by us, by the hands of a godly and reverend " Doctor of Divinity, a Member at that time of that " House; it was carried up to the upper House of the " Convocation, where the Spiritual Lords sat. From " whom no answer was brought us until this day; where- " with, as divers of the lower Convocation House com- " plain'd, that a Petition, offer'd to the whole, should " be smother'd in the hand of one, and should never be " read, perused, nor seen into by them; so you may un- " derstand how the Bishops had then stopped all their " ears of compassion against us; so that no humble suit, " no obtestation in the bowels of Christ Jesus, for the " honour of God, and the holy peace of the Church, " no cries, which would have moved brazen and iron " hearts, could move them once to regard us, or hear " us, or in that assembly consider what we had said, or " make us any answer, good or evil." ‖

The Ministers complain'd, that the Bishops, by their third Article, requir'd a subscription to all the XXXIX *Articles of Religion*, which was more than the Act of Parliament would warrant. " For, says Mr. *Fenner*, neither " in express words, nor any sounding that way, doth that " law require subscription, or assent, further than to all " the Articles of religion, which only concern the con- " fession of the true faith, and the doctrine of the Sacra- " ments compris'd in a Book intituled, *Articles*, &c." And elsewhere he remarks: " That the end of the Sta- " tute was express'd in these words: *That the Churches of* " *the Queen's Majesty's dominions may be served with Pas-* " *tors of sound religion, be it enacted, &c.* Whereby 'tis " evident, *says he*, that this was made as a brazen wall " to keep Papists and other Heretics out of the Pastor's " chair: which the Bishops have made so strong a cord " to pull men (by their own confession) of sound re- " ligion

* *Page* 78. † *p.* 86, *&c.* ‖ *p.* 80.

" ligion out, as in many places it pulleth down the chair " and all." *

And now I am fallen upon this Book, which relates to these times, and was printed 1587, I shall take notice of several other passages, which will give us light concerning them. Thus then he reproveth the corruptions of those times, and vindicates Ministers, who spake against them: " If the pride of life be to be thundred a- " gainst in all men, ought the Bishops to be left out, " who, contrary to the express commandment of Christ, " the profession of many Martyrs at their death, their " own writings and admonitions in former times, do live " in all ostentation of pomp, daintiness of fair, superflu- " ity of expences, greatness of retinue, rather like Nobles " and Dukes, than Ministers and Ambassadors of our " Lord Jesus Christ?" † In referring to their own writings and admonitions, he had an eye to *Aylmer*, at that time Bishop of *London*; whose *Harbourough for faithful Subjects* he cites in the Margin. And truly the passage is so very full, and serves so well to shew the baseness of that persecuting Bishop, who lived at the very time I am treating of, that I shall here transcribe it from his Book. " Come off you Bishops, away with your su- " perfluities, yield up your thousands, be content with " hundreds, as they be in other reform'd Churches, " where be as great learned men as you are. Let your " portion be priest-like and not price-like. Let the " Queen have the rest of your temporalities and other " lands to maintain these wars which you procur'd, " and your mistress left her, and with the rest to build " and found schools through out the realm: that every " parish Church may have his Preacher, every city his " Superintendent to live honestly and not pompously; " which will never be, unless your lands be dispersed and " bestowed upon many, which now feedeth and fatteth " but one. Remember that *Abimilec*, when *David* in " his banishment wou'd have dined with him, kept such " hospitality, that he had no bread in his house to give " him, but the shew bread. Where was all his superfluity " to keep your pretended hospitality? For that is the " cause that you alledge, why you must have thousands,

" as

* Page 51. † P. 52.

" as though you were commanded to keep hoſpitality, " rather with a thouſand, than with an hundredth. I " would our countryman *Wicliefe*'s book, which he wrote " *De Eccleſia*, were in print, and there ſhould you ſee " that your wrinches and cavillations, be nothing worth. " It was my chance to happen of it in ones hand, that " brought it out of *Bohemia.*" But this Biſhop could be very well content himſelf to drive Miniſters from their people, that many pariſhes might be without Preachers, when he was getting thouſands by it: and indeed he ſeems to be a man, who never wanted a ſalvo for getting money; and this was his excuſe, when he was reproach'd with his own words: *When I was a child, I ſpake as a child, I thought as a child.** But I go on again with Mr. *Fenner*'s words: " At leaſt wiſe ſhould not the diſorders " of their [the Biſhops] houſholds, the daily abuſe of " God his name, in the mouths both of their ſervants " and of themſelves, the bribes of their officers and of- " ficials, with others, the abuſes of their Courts: a " mongſt other things their licences granted to children, " who have not the conſent of their parents, to marry " ſecretly, or without orderly publiſhing of the contract, " thereby defeating both the laws of God, and of men, " their commutation of penances: ſhould not theſe, I " ſay, likewiſe, with moderation be reproved? " Elſe- where he tells us, there were " Multitudes, which in " three months time, had ſo many ſtars, yea, even the " third part either taken from them, or cover'd with ſuch " a cloud of ſuſpenſions, as they could not for a long " time, nay, ſome not to this day, receive any light from " them, or others for them: that there was a great " complaint of all the ſhires almoſt of her Majeſty's do- " minions, by general, by particular ſupplications: that " by this means, perſons, if they would hear a ſermon, " muſt go, in ſome places, five, ſeven, or twelve miles; " yea many times, in ſome ſhires, fourteen or twenty " miles. And farther, thoſe, who ſhould have encou- " raged men to go hear, have made them pay twelve " pence a Sabbath, for being abſent from their pariſh " Church; it being undoubtedly proved, they went to " hear a ſermon elſewhere." † In another place he tells us,

* Strype's Life of Aylm. *p.* 269. † 148.

us, how ſcandalouſly many places were at that time ſupply'd: "That ſo many lights in divers ſhires at once "were ſtruck out; when ſomewhere an old Maſs Prieſt, "ſcarce able to read diſtinctly, and of evil example of "life; ſomewhere a Preacher, but with counterfeit letters "of orders, lately come out of *Bridewel*, and after for "ſhame fain to fly away: ſomewhere bare and naked "Readers; ſomewhere a Preacher, having a Benefice in "another ſhire; lately a Farmer, not able rightly and "fruitfully to open any place of Scripture, with compe-"tency of gifts fit for a Miniſter, wander'd from one "congregation to another, to diſcharge a ſmall piece of "duty." * He ſays: "There was a difference in the "form of ſubſcriptions. The Miniſters of *Suſſex* in their "ſubſcription (a copy of which they receiv'd under the "Biſhop's ſeal) excepted all things in the Rubrics, "unleſs they were ſo underſtood, as they did not re-"pugn the Holy Scriptures, or the analogy of faith, "as 'tis now maintain'd by the Church of *England.*" † He ſays: "Several ſubſcrib'd not the Articles at all, or any "thing like them." He complains: "That they ſuffer'd the "ſworn Notary to deny them a copy of their ſubſcriptions, "ſuſpenſions, deprivations, and public acts paſſed againſt "them. If they had copies hereof, *he ſays*, it would ap-"pear ſome ſubſcrib'd thus: *We ſubſcribe theſe Articles as "they agree with the Word of God:* or, *dempto ſecundo*, "that is, *taking away the ſecond:* with divers others of "the like nature." Many lamented their ſlip in ſubſcribing. And when Dr. *Bridges* had ſaid: *They ſhould then openly revoke their ſubſcription:* He anſwers: "They are "withheld becauſe they think it in vain, ſeeing one at-"tempting to do it, was utterly deny'd to raſe out his "name again: otherwiſe they make it notorious enough "to all men, to whom the knowledge thereof doth ap-"pertain." ‖ In another place of his Book he complains, that Miniſters were undermin'd in this buſineſs of ſubſcribing: "That it was promis'd to ſome, who had ſubſcrib'd "according to the Archbiſhop's godly interpretations, that "they ſhould have a copy of the ſame, which after they "could not get: that others ſubſcrib'd with this and "that condition; but afterward their names were muſter'd "in

* *Page* 14. † *p.* 119. ‖ *p.* 120.

" in one rank with the reſt, as being all under the ſame " colours: that others were promis'd, after this ſubſcrip- " tion, much favour and protection againſt their evil diſ- " pos'd and Popiſh enemies; which yet afterward they " felt as the ſhadow of a naked tree in the latter end of a " hot and dry ſummer, being rather more moleſted in " their Commiſſaries Court than before; yea even touch- " ing theſe matters of the uſe of the Book, and that by " haling and pulling of ſentences generally ſpoken, as if " they had ſpecially been ſpoken againſt the Book of " Common Prayer; whereof one was even driven to this " point, that openly in the Pulpit he muſt revoke his ſay- " ing, or elſe afreſh depart from his Church: that Mr. " *F.* [I ſuppoſe the author himſelf] was made to ſwear " to anſwer to Articles, which he might not ſee till after- " ward; and then urg'd upon his oath, not only to con- " feſs the matters wherewith he was charg'd, but *any ſuch* " *thing, or any thing ſounding that way*, and not only of " *public ſpeech*, but of *private, when, or whereſoever they* " *were ſpoken*; and not only the things, but *the words*; " and not only the words, but *the occaſion whereon, the* " *manner how, the reaſon why any ſuch things were ſaid*; " and that not of one, but every Article, to the number " of ſeventeen." *

He gives ſome touches of the mild and gentle treatment the Miniſters met with: " When the Articles were firſt " urg'd upon all Miniſters [I ſuppoſe he means in *London*] " by the Archdeacon and Commiſſary, the Archdeacon " —— openly determin'd before hand, that ſuch as did " refuſe to ſubſcribe to thoſe Articles, were ſuch as diſal- " low'd her Majeſty's authority, and refus'd to allow the " faith and miniſtry of this Church to be the true faith, " and any lawful miniſtry. The Miniſters ſomewhat " griev'd with this rough beginning, determin'd before- " hand, e're the courſe of law paſſed, to go to the Bi- " ſhop; thinking thereby to obtain more moderation of " him, if not for the matter itſelf, yet for the manner of " dealing. Being come, they ſend two before with ſup- " plicaion, to deſire to know his Lordſhip's pleaſure, if " they ſhould come together, or in what ſort he would " accept them to conference, becauſe that they were ma- " ny.

* Page 41.

" ny. He at the first, before many Gentlemen and o-
" thers, draweth out certain accusations, not yet drawn
" into Articles, which concern'd one of the said Mini-
" sters; and having read them, saith: *You are boys, prin-*
" *cokes*, &c. *and will you teach all others?*" And having misrepresented an argument of one of the Ministers, he used this language to him: " If I had a boy in *Cam-*
" *bridge*, who would make such reasons, I would britch
" him; but I will make you known for such as you are,
" and, I trowe, I am able to prove Heresy against you.
" Well, seeing you are come thus disorderly, come toge-
" ther to me in the afternoon, or else I will suspend you
" all." * When they came in the afternoon, they were first charg'd with a design to raise tumults, and by number to outface their superiors; and then had leave to propose their doubts. And then an antient Minister urg'd, that the Book of Common Prayer tolerated an unpreaching Ministry, and so was contrary to the Word of God, and urg'd the Bishop with some parts of his own writings heretofore [I suppose what I cited from the *Harborough*.] To him therefore he answer'd: *You are a fool, and can say nothing, hold your peace, let another speak.* When another argued: That the foreskin cut off in circumcision was not the outward Element of the Sacrament, any more than the filthiness of the flesh which the water carried away: The Bishop stopp'd his mouth, saying, *He was a dolt*; and ask'd another, If that was his judgment? When another charg'd the Archdeacon with uncharitable dealing, the Bishop said: *Have him away, let him go home, and scold with his wife.*

In another assembly, not long after, of many Bishops, some Deans, and some Civilians, one of the Bishops reason'd with one of the Ministers, about *Matth.* xx. 25. *The princes of the Gentiles exercise dominion, but it shall not be so with you.* The Bishop asserted, that the word κατακυριεύουσιν being compounded, signified *tyrannical dominion*, in that place, and 1 *Pet.* v. 3. † The Minister confuted him from *Luke* xxii. 25. where the simple word is used for the same thing: and from what stands in opposition to it, both in *Matthew* and *Peter*: and from the

LXX

* Page 42. † *And if that had been the meaning of the Word, it had been sufficient to overthrow their* dominion, *which was* Tyrannical *with a witness.*

LXX Interpreters, who uſe it in ſpeaking of Chriſt's government, which was not tyrannical, *Pſal.* cx. 2. *Rule thou* in the midſt of thine enemies. The Biſhop look'd then hotly upon him, and ſaid: Will you follow the LXX in their whole Tranſlation? To which anſwer was made: No, but they might well be alledg'd for the uſe of a *Greek* word. Then the Biſhop, having nothing further to ſay, looked ſtedfaſtly upon him, and ſaid: *Thou boy, beardleſs boy, yeſterday-bird, new out of the ſhell: muſt not the ſpirits of the Prophets be ſubject to the Prophets?* Were not theſe Miniſters, do we think, inexcuſable, who would not be convinc'd by ſuch clear reaſonings, ſet off with ſo much advantage of fine rhetoric?

" About the ſame time, two Miniſters, who had be-
" fore ſubſcrib'd with great limitation and exception, be-
" ing call'd for about a letter, and well rattled by the
" Biſhop; to one ſaying: *Michael* the Archangel, my
" Lord, gave the Devil no ſuch words: he fiercely turn'd
" about and ſaid, *Michael'ſt thou me?* To the other ſay-
" ing: I beſeech you, my Lord, let us rather undergo
" any puniſhment, than be ſo judg'd of: he anſwer'd:
" *Undergo aſs, undergo gooſe, undergo fool;* as you are
" fantaſtical in your opinions, ſo are you in your words.
" Where didſt thou ever read, *undergo?* I omit (ſays my
" author) many unſavoury vows; as, If ever you preach,
" and do not ſubſcribe ſimply, hang me up at *Tyburn.*"
Who this Biſhop was, I cannot certainly ſay, and dont care to trouble the reader with only a conjecture: it appears, he was not the ſame with the former.

He ſays: " The Biſhops would not yield the ſame li-
" berty to all Miniſters, which would by oath, promiſe,
" and bond, have tied themſelves to the ſame peaceable
" behaviour; which ſome grave and godly Miniſters of
" *Suffolk*, and *Warwickſhire*, were dimitted withal, and
" not urged to ſubſcribe." * He then requires into the cauſe of that moderation toward them, and argues, it could not be compaſſion to poor Miniſters, oppreſs'd with the charge of a wife and children; becauſe they refus'd it to ſuch as were in greater want, than thoſe whom they ſo us'd: it was not in pity to the people; becauſe the congregations, whom they depriv'd of their Miniſters, were

* Page 45.

were many of them larger than those they favour'd. And how little compassion they had for the people, he says, appears by the answers they gave them, when they petition'd for their Pastors liberty: *We are*, say they, *your Pastors; those you sue for are our substitutes.* To others, complaining of their seldom hearing good preaching, they answer'd: *Learn to practise that in one quarter, which you heard in the former.* He says therefore, the true cause of their shewing so much favour to some was, that they were commended to them by two most honourable and antient Counsellors; and they were afraid, lest otherwise their doings should have been better look'd into.

And when Dr. *Bridges* had deny'd they were *grievously afflicted*, unless it were caused by their own demerits; he thus answers him: " A light cause, yea an " humble supplication to her Majesty, and the whole Par- " liament, allow'd by public authority, suing to themselves " also, as to fathers, may with them be cause of close " imprisonment. But is it no grievous affliction, by sus- " pension so to be hang'd for a year or two, between " hope and despair, as in the mean while they must see " the wages of their labours eaten up by loiterers? Nay, " which is the very temptation of *Lot*, their righteous " souls must be vexed with seeing, beholding, and hear- " ing the ignorance, the profane speeches, and the evil " example of those thrust upon their charges: they them- " selves of the wicked defam'd, reproach'd, scoff'd at, " call'd seditious and rebellious, cited, accus'd, and in- " dicted, and yet no redress to be found. All this they " patiently bore, and came daily to the congregations, " to the Prayers, to the Baptisms, and to the Sacraments, " and by their example, and admonitions, kept many " from abuses, whereto rashness of zeal would have car- " ry'd them: yet now, for their labour, by you [Dr. " *Bridges*] they are, to their great grief, openly slan- " der'd, *to refuse the public ministry of the Word and Sa-* " *craments* a thing, which every congregation can, and " must needs, by testimony of the whole parish, refel: " a thing, which it is almost impossible, but that you " yourself should know the contrary: a thing, which " our supplications offer'd unto their Honours, wherein " we acknowledged the ministry of the Church of *Eng-* " *land*, in the Word preach'd, and administration of the " Sacraments, as touching the substance, to be lawful;

" which also our daily practice in all, without exception, " convinceth to be as false, as any thing, of such respect, " can be true. And altho', to such as you are, who " swarm with Deanries, double Benefices, Pensions, " Advowsons, Reversions, *&c.* these molestations seem " light; yet upon every irreligious man's complaint, in " such things as many times are incredible, to be by " the Pursuivants sent for, to pay two pence for every " mile, to find messengers, to defray their own charges, " to such as can hardly, with that they have, clothe and " feed themselves and their families, 'tis not only grie- " vous, but as far as worldly trouble may be, a very " heart-burning. 'Tis grievous to a free man born, to " a free Minister, so to be brought into a slavish sub- " jection unto a Commissary, as at his pleasure, upon e- " very trifling complaint, to be summon'd: and coming " there, at the least with unnecessary expences, master- " like answers, yea, sometimes open revilings, to be sent " home again." *

I will only transcribe one passage more, because, beside the relation it has to the history of our controversy in these times, it shews the candour and ingenuity of the author. " We will, *says he*, never so burthen our selves, " but that we will acknowledge our cause to be good, " and our affections and purposes also, both towards " God, his Church, and her Majesty, and their Honours " [the Privy Council] yet again also, we will not so " justify our selves, but that when coming by dozens and " scores to the Bishops, after half a days disorderly rea- " soning, some not being heard to the full, some " rail'd on, and miscall'd, none with lenity satis- " fied, we were all suspended from our office, be- " cause we would not assent to subscribe to the two last " Articles; there might also pass from us some affections " and infirmities afterward, as that her Majesty and their " Honours might with justice and wisdom defer the " ending of these matters, until they had further tried " our spirits. This and many other things else, both " might we, and would we impute to our selves, rather " than undutifully charge them. But if they will needs " have us declare our judgment, where the fault lay, we " say

* *Page* 46.

" ſay not in her Majeſty, and their Honours, at the table " of whoſe Honourable Senate, our ſupplications were " not only with patience read and perus'd in our preſence; " but after we were put apart with a moſt godly and " wiſe charge, to diſcharge our duty in obedience and " good carriage of our ſelves to our ſuperiours, and to- " wards the peace of the Church, we receiv'd an anſwer, " that they would ſend our ſupplications to the Arch- " biſhop, and not only underſtand his anſwer, but alſo " require, that with moderation we might be dealt with, " and that none ſhould be ſuſpended or depriv'd, not be- " ing firſt according to law, yea with conſcionable favour " convicted; which as we doubt not it was promis'd to " them, ſo how well it was perform'd, we ſhall have oc- " caſion to ſpeak afterward. " *

Another writer of thoſe times in a little Tract call'd, *The Practices of the Prelates*, hath ſeveral paſſages to the ſame purpoſe. I ſhall only tranſcribe one from him. " Hear likewiſe what author it [the rigorous proceeding " of thoſe times] hath. And touching this, who can de- " ny it came from the humour of one Man [the Archbi- " ſhop] as may be eſteem'd, more carried away with pri- " vate conceit, than any grave counſel and godly experience; " perhaps (as my ſelf of ſome of them underſtand) a- " gainſt the tide of the advice of many of their own " coat; but undoubtedly againſt almoſt the former prac- " tice of three or four and twenty years experience, of " the peaceable government that hath been under her ſa- " cred Majeſty, and ſome of the beſt of thoſe grave and " Chriſtian predeceſſors of his; who, howſoever towards " ſome particular good men ſome hard dealing here and " there were ſhew'd by the inſtigation of ſome ignorant " and half popiſh perſons, for lack of judgment and " knowledge; yet none ever dealt ſo generally againſt " the whole Miniſtry, and ſo eagerly againſt the ſtream " and light of all mens judgments, in ſo learned an age, " before this new plot was heard of, and now, alaſs; " with too much calamity is felt? " †

This year Mr. *Anthony Babington*, at the inſtigation of *Ballard* the Jeſuit, and under the direction of *Mary* Queen of *Scotland*, MDLXXXVI.

took

M 2

* *Pag.* 12. † In Part of a Regiſter, *p.* 282.

took up a resolution of killing Queen *Elizabeth*. The contrivance was, that the Papists were to enter into an association, under the pretence of being afraid of the Puritans; and when he and his fellow traitors had murder'd the Queen, they were to charge the fact upon the Puritans. This precedent has been since frequently follow'd, and therefore I thought it not amiss to take this brief notice of it.

The Convocation sitting this year, the Ministers presented them, in *Latin*, another Petition, a Translation of which is still extant.* They complain very much of the unreasonable subjection of Pastors to a Lay Chancellor, who knew nothing at all of the Pastor's office; and request they might be indifferently heard: but the truth is, they touch'd the temporalities of the Bishops so closely, that I dont much wonder their Petition did not please the Prelates of that time.

MDLXXXVII. Having said so much of the persecution in general about this time, I shall omit some particular cases which might be mention'd.

This year the House of Commons sent a Petition to the Lords, † complaining of many parishes being destitute of Preachers, and no care taken to supply them: they moved that this, and many other evils, might be taken into consideration and speedily redress'd: that care might be taken to prevent insufficient Ministers: that no oath or subscription might be tender'd to any at their entrance into the Ministry, but such as is expresly prescrib'd by the statutes of this realm, except the oath against corrupt entring: that they may not be troubled for omission of some rites, or portions prescrib'd in the Book of Common Prayer: that they might not be call'd and urg'd to answer before Officials, and Commissaries, but before the Bishops themselves: that such as had been suspended, or deprived, for no other offence, but only for not subscribing, might be restor'd: that the Bishops would forbear their excommunication, *ex mero officio*, of godly and learned Preachers, not detected for open offence of life, or apparent error in doctrine: that they might not be call'd before the High Commission, or out of the Dioceses where they lived, except for some notable offence: that it might be per-

* Part of a Register, *p.* 323. † Fuller, Ch. Hist. *b.* 9. *p.* 189.

permitted to them in every Archdeaconry, to have ſome common exerciſes and conferences among themſelves, to be limited and preſcrib'd by the Ordinaries: that the high cenſure of excommunication might not be denounc'd or executed for ſmall matters; nor by Chancellors, Commiſſaries, or Officials, but by the Biſhops themſelves, with the aſſiſtance of grave perſons: that nonreſidency might be quite remov'd out of the Church; or at leaſt that, according to the Queen's injunctions, Art. 44. No Nonreſident, having already a licence or faculty, may enjoy it, unleſs he depute an able Curate, that may weekly preach and catechize, as is requir'd in her Majeſty's injunctions. The Archbiſhop, with the reſt of the Biſhops, oppos'd theſe proceedings with all their might; and fearing leſt their intereſt in Parliament ſhould not be great enough to ſtop them, they preſented a fawning Petition to the Queen, craving her Majeſty's protection againſt the Parliament; advancing by that means, according as they have uſually done, the prerogative, which needed not in that Queen's reign. They lament the woful and diſtreſs'd ſtate they were like to fall into: tell her, that innovations are dangerous in a ſettled ſtate: and annex a catalogue of thoſe inconveniences, which would enſue to the ſtate preſent, ſtate to come, Cathedral Churches, Univerſities, to her Majeſty, to religion, in caſe pluralities were taken away. 'Twas not therefore without good reaſon, that the Lord *Gray* ſaid, they were all enemies to Reformation, becauſe it touch'd their freeholds.

Biſhop *Burnet* freely condemns thoſe things, which they ſo earneſtly endeavour'd to preſerve. "There are, "*ſays he*, a great many abuſes brought in in the worſt "times, and now purg'd out of ſome of the Churches "of the *Roman* communion, which yet continue, and "are too much in uſe among us; ſuch as *pluralities*, *non-reſidences*, and other things of that nature. So that it "may be ſaid, that ſome of the manifeſt corruptions of "Popery, where they are recommended by the advan-"tages that accompany them, are not yet throughly pur-"ged out, notwithſtanding all the noiſe we have made "about Reformation in matters much more diſputable, "and of far leſs conſequence. —— Theſe are abuſes that "even the Church of *Rome*, after all her impudence is "aſham'd of, and are at this day generally diſcounte-"nanc'd all *France* over. Queen *Mary* here in *England*,

" in the time of Popery, ſet her ſelf effectually to root " them out. And that they ſhould be ſtill found among " Proteſtants, and in ſo reform'd a Church, is a ſcandal " that may juſtly make us bluſh. " *

And why ſhould not the Biſhops in Queen *Elizabeth*'s time have bluſh'd at theſe things alſo? Why did they ſo mortally hate a Reformation herein? If the Biſhops then had been of the ſame Mind with this excellent Prelate, our diſputes would have been certainly at an end, and therefore to them deſervedly belongs the glory of their being continued.

But now I return to Dr. *Nichols*, who, ſpeaking of this year, ſays: *After this, ſome hot-headed men of the party proceed to that inſolence, as to ſpare neither order nor dignity; for in their libels publiſh'd againſt the Biſhops, they do not afford* Whitgift, *then Archbiſhop of* Canterbury, *any better name than the* Belzebub *of* Canterbury, *&c.* † I will not undertake the defence of libels. The cruelty and tyranny of the Biſhops, and eſpecially of Archbiſhop *Whitgift*, was a great provocation (as every one muſt with me acknowledge, if they have any knowledge of thoſe times) but yet, in my opinion, they ſhould not have treated them with ſuch coarſe language. Our Adverſaries however have no great reaſon to reproach them, with what they firſt provok'd them to: and they may be ſenſible, that 'tis not hard to collect as reproachful ſpeeches of ſome of their own ſide, utter'd not only againſt us, but againſt the Proteſtants abroad in general. And it is very unjuſt in our Author to form a charge againſt a whole party, upon the act of one or two obſcure nameleſs authors, who might be of the baſer ſort, but however were not own'd and defended by the party. Thus it was charg'd in his *Latin* edition; and ſince now in the *Engliſh* he ſays, this was the act of *ſome hot-headed Men*, certainly they were not worthy to be mention'd; for ſuch may be met with in every party, I am ſure, great multitudes of them in his own. Mr. *Cartwright*, in his *Apology*, declares, that from the firſt time he ever heard of *Martin Marprelate*, he teſtified his great diſliking and grief for ſo naughty and diſorderly a courſe, as his was. Nor do I remember to have ever ſeen any one of the Puritan

* Hiſt. Ref. *Vol.* 2. *Pref.* † *p.* 30.

Puritan writers (not including the *Brownists*) who speaks favourably of the writings, which came out under the name of *Martin*.

As to the authors he cites, as using the most reviling language, the first and third are both one: for, *Any Work for the Cooper*, was put out under the name of *Martin*. The second, being the *Letter from* Scotland, I know nothing of, and might come, for ought I know, from the same hand. But as to the fourth Author, cited by him, as *Udal's Dialogue*, I believe he is mistaken. That *Udal* wrote any *Dialogue* was not prov'd against him, nor confess'd by himself: the *Dialogue*, that was suppos'd to be his, is not divided, if I mistake not, into Chapters; but is that, which is printed in the *Part of a Register*, *p.* 333, *&c.* wherein I do not meet with those hard names our Author sets down.

Afterwards in a certain Petition offer'd to the Parliament, entituled, A Supplication to the Parliament, *and subscrib'd by ten thousand hands, they threaten the Houses with no less than a rising, if they do not take care to establish the discipline; which if they did not take care speedily to do*, "*They would be in danger of the terrible mass of God's* "*wrath both* in this Life, *and that to come; that they* "*might well hope for the curse of the Law, but the favour* "*and loving countenance of Jesus Christ they should never* "*see.*" I can't find any where mention made of *a Supplication* thus subscrib'd in Queen *Elizabeth*'s reign, and am very much mistaken in her government, if a Petition, that must be handed about a long time, and could not be kept secret, and that was so contrary to her Mind, would not have had a stop put to it, long before so many hands could be procur'd to subscribe it. I desire farther, that the reader would here take notice of the hard construction which the Doctor gives to the words, which he cites of the *Supplication*. The Puritans were convinc'd of the necessity of a farther Reformation, and look'd upon the maintaining such a corrupt Church government, as ours is, to be a grievous sin, highly provoking to God: and having these apprehensions, they honestly warn the Parliament of the danger; telling them, they could not but expect some fearful judgments of God. To this an invidious turn is given, that *they threaten the Houses with a rising*; whereas they always declar'd against any seditious

practices, and never could be charg'd with any. They were for setting up Christ's government, not by popular tumults, but peaceably, however the law had unrighteously forbid it. But nothing was more likely to instigate the government against them, than the representing them as seditious persons. This was the common practice of our Enemies at that time, and ever since continues to be so. And yet I am persuaded our Adversaries were more charitably dealt with, when they were charg'd with belying their own consciences in such accusations; than were the Puritans, whose words were thus perverted, for no other end, but to render them obnoxious to the government. But God has given these men an opportunity in our time, to shew they have that in their hearts, of which they are so forward to accuse their neighbours.

Our Author next complains, these things were publish'd, when *the* Spanish *Armada was hovering over our country*. But since *Martin*'s writings, as he complains himself, did not please the Puritans, I can't see how they are concern'd in them. And besides, the writers he is displeas'd with, might well alledge as an excuse, that they wrote when they were groaning under the cruel persecutions of the Bishops. And how easy is it to retort our Author's own words upon him? Such persecution, *tho' it was at all times most unbecoming, it was at that time more especially so; because then the* Spanish *Armada was hovering over our nation, threatning destruction both to our country and religion.* But our Author goes on:

Nor indeed would they have proceeded to such a boldness, but that it was thought they were buoy'd up by the Earl of Leicester, *Sir* Francis Walsingham, *Sir* Francis Knollis, *with some other great men of the court, who long'd to be fingering the Church revenues; thinking if they could get the Bishops to be pull'd down by the Puritans, their lands would be a no inconsiderable prey for themselves.* But certainly our Adversaries are very *bold*, who think they may asperse all men, who in the least differ from them. The credit of history is much impair'd, by that party spirit, which too often govern'd men in writing it. Thus learned men think, little credit is to be given to many of the accounts which we have of those Emperours, who were call'd *Iconomachi*, because they are penn'd by a parcel of Monks,

Monks, zealots for the worſhip of images, and therefore bitter enemies to thoſe Emperours for oppoſing it. Nor are our Adverſaries many times more worthy to be believ'd, who are often much fonder of their own fancies, than the truth. But ſince 'tis generally allow'd, that ſuch perſons have been very deſerving, whom their very adverſaries have commended, let us hear what is ſaid of theſe courtiers by Dr. *Fuller*, a much more fair and candid writer than Dr. *Heylyn*, upon whoſe credit (tho' he deſerv'd none) they are beſpatter'd.

Concerning Sir *F. Walſingham* thus he writes: "Amongſt all the favourers of the Presbyterians, ſurely "honeſty and wiſdom never met more in any, than in "Sir *Francis Walſingham*, of whom it may be ſaid, as "of St. *Paul: Tho' poor, yet making many rich.* Having "but one only daughter, he neglected wealth in himſelf, "tho' I may ſay, he inriched many, even the *Engliſh* "nation, by his prudent ſteering of ſtate affairs." * Mr. *Camden* agrees with *Fuller*, and ſays, that by the charges of his public ſervices, "He weaken'd his eſtate, "and brought himſelf ſo far in debt, that he was privately buried in the evening in *Paul's* Church yard at "*London*, without any funeral ſolemnity." †

Concerning Sir *Francis Knollis*, Dr. *Fuller* only ſays: "That being bred a baniſhed man in *Germany*, during "the reign of Queen *Mary*, and converſing with Mr. "*Calvin* at *Geneva*, he was never after fond of Epiſcopacy, but was a great patron of Nonconformiſts."

It muſt be own'd, he accuſes the Earl of *Leiceſter* of being a means to incenſe the Queen againſt Archbiſhop *Grindal*, and attributes to him her being ſo much diſpleas'd with his Letter about *Propheſyings*. He ſays: "*Leiceſter* caſt a covetous eye upon *Lambeth houſe*, alledging as good arguments for his obtaining thereof, as "ever were urged by *Ahab* for *Naboth's vineyard*. Now "*Grindal*, though generally condemn'd for remiſneſs in "this kind, (parting with more from his ſee, than ever "his ſucceſſours thank'd him for, ſtoutly oppos'd the "alienating of this his principal palace, and made the "*Leiceſtrian* party to malice him." If this ſtory were true, that ſome greedy courtiers, at that time, encourag'd the

* *Lib. 3. p.* 161. † Eliz. *p.* 444.

the Reformation we desir'd, from an expectation of serving their own particular interest by it; our cause cannot reasonably be thought to be more disgrac'd by it, than is that of the Reformation in general, which, all the world knows, was promoted by such courtiers, who lost nothing by it. But to say the truth, the story itself has not any great appearance of probability: the Earl was esteem'd the chief friend of the Puritans in the court, and was not displeas'd at his being thought to favour them. 'Tis not therefore likely, he would oppose the Archbishop in a matter so pleasing to the Puritans, as these exercises were. Whatever handle he used, he would never take this to incense the Queen against him, as long as he had any design of currying favour with those people. But Mr. *Strype*, the most diligent enquirer into the history of those times, does fully confute this part of the story, with this very substantial reason: That the Archbishop made use of the Earl himself in this matter, and by his hands sent the Letter to her Majesty;* which he would never have done, had there been at that time any grudge between them. And since this, so material a circumstance of the report, is certainly false, 'tis but reasonable to suppose the rest is of a piece with it, and that it deserves the same credit with some other stories, devis'd to blast his reputation, and that perhaps upon the account of the favour he shew'd to good men, groaning under the cruel oppression of the Hierarchy. †

And now let any man judge, whether Dr. *Heylin*, whom alone Dr. *Nichols* produces, as his voucher in this matter, is to be believ'd. Indeed I can't but remark, that when our Author deals in scandal, he makes much use of him; tho' he speaks elsewhere slightly of him, as entertaining some Popish opinions. ‖ He is really an author, who had no regard to truth, when he wrote concerning his adversaries. But let two famous Bishops, of the Church of *England*, determine what credit he deserves: the one is Dr. *Barlow*, Bishop of *Lincoln*, who calls his performances, "*Peter Heylin*'s angry, and (to our Church "and truth) scandalous writings." ‡ The other is Bishop *Burnet*, who says: "Either he was very ill in-
"form'd

* Grindal's Life, *p.* 224. † Ibid. *p.* 224. 225. ‖ *p.* 169. ‡ Genuine Remains, *p.* 181.

" form'd, or very much led by his paſſions.——— In one " thing he is not to be excus'd, that he never vouch'd " any authority for what he writ: which is not to be " forgiven any, who write of tranſactions beyond their " own time, and deliver new things not known before. " So that upon what grounds he wrote a great deal of " his book, we can only conjecture; and many in their " gueſſes are not apt to be very favourable to him." *

Archbiſhop *Whitgift*, as I ſaid, forbad *Cartwright* to confute the *Rhemiſts* Tranſlation of the New Teſtament: but this year ſome more effectual care was taken by him and his Brethren, to prevent his doing it. One and thirty Articles were exhibited againſt him, drawn up after the laudable faſhion of the *Spaniſh* Inquiſition. † To all which he was requir'd to give in his anſwer upon oath. The matter of theſe Articles was partly ſome idle tittle tattle, which they had gather'd up, more fit for good women to talk of at a goſſipping, than to be turn'd into Articles by Biſhops. Such are thoſe, wherein he is articled againſt, for that diſcourſing about women, and their childbirth, *&c.* he did ſpeak thereof ſo indiſcreetly and offenſively, that ſundry of them, in *great grief*, had conſpir'd to have miſchiev'd him with ſtones in the ſtreet. ‖ That by his perſuaſions his own wife, and other women, had refus'd to be church'd after they had lain in. ‡ That he had nouriſh'd a faction, and heart-burning of one inhabitant in *Warwick* againſt another, ſevering them in his own, and his followers ſpeeches, by the names of *the godly*, or *brethren favouring ſincerity*; and *the prophane*. * And in this number I may rank another: That being a Miniſter, according to the order of the Church of *England*, he had renounc'd the ſaid orders, as Antichriſtian. † Others were grand impertinences, wherein the Biſhops were not concern'd; as, That he had been ordain'd again at *Antwerp* or *Middleburg*, had ſet up a Presbytery there, and ordain'd others there in a manner different from the Church of *England*, and uſed another Liturgy, like the Foreign Churches. ‖ Others were inſnaring: as, That he knew, or was credibly inform'd, of the authors of *Martin Marprelate*,

MDXC.

* Hiſtor. Ref. *Part* I. *Pref.* † Fuller, Ch. Hiſt. *B.* 9 *p.* 198. ‖ *Art.* 15. ‡ *Art.* 16. * *Art.* 22. † *Art.* 1. ‖ *Art.* 2, &c.

prelate, The Demonſtration of the Diſcipline, Diotrephes, &c. and did not diſcover them.* That he had ſet up Claſſes, Conferences, Synods, *&c.* † There was another, which one would think they ſhould have commended him for, if, according to the commination on *Aſh Wedneſday*, they wiſh'd for the reſtoration of diſcipline: That when his ſervant had committed fornication, and gotten a baſtard in his houſe, he, taking upon him the authority of the Ordinary, did appoint unto the delinquent, a public form of penance, or ſatisfaction, in St. *Mary*'s Church in *Warwick*, and caus'd him to perform the ſame.

But there being no law in our nation, which obliges a man to accuſe himſelf, *Cartwright* refus'd to anſwer to thoſe Articles. Whereupon, according to their uſual lenity, they caſt him into priſon, without alledging any thing againſt him. With *Cartwright* were many other Miniſters in priſon at the ſame time: *viz. Fen, King, Wight, Payne, Lord, Snape, Proudlove*, and *Jewel. Cartwright* had lain a while in priſon, and was not only teaz'd by the Archbiſhop, but by another of his Brethren in perſecution, Biſhop *Aylmer*. This Biſhop, together with Dr. *Bancroft*, (afterwards Archbiſhop of *Canterbury*) Dr. *Lewin*, and Sir *John Popham*, the Attorney General, ſent for *Cartwright* out of the *Fleet*, to appear before the Biſhop in his chamber. There he rattles him, for "abu-"ſing the Privy Council, by informing them of his diſea-"ſes, wherewith he was not troubled. For, *ſays Mr.* "*Strype*, *Cartwright* had lately ſued to them for his li-"berty from the *Fleet*, upon pretence of his Gout and "Sciatica: which, it ſeems, was more in pretence than "truth." ‖ I ſhould never take *Aylmer*'s word for that. *Cartwright* had been ſo harraſs'd by his perſecutors, and had lain now long enough in priſon to contract diſtempers; and, being old beſide, might be ſuppos'd, eſpecially with ſuch uſage, to be infirm, as *Fuller* aſſures us he was in his latter time. Another thing he rattled him for was, his "ſuggeſting, that the oath, tendred "to them, was not according to law, and that it "was given generally without limitation." Both theſe things, I doubt not, were true: the latter appears by all

* *Art.* 24. † *Art.* 25, &c. ‖ Aylm. Life, p. 16.

all the accounts we have of the manner of their proceedings: the former he had from such as were learn'd in the law. The thing in its own nature was barbarous, and being without law was intolerably tyrannical. But 'twas a greater crime in the Ministers to complain of unjust usage, than for the Bishop to be the cause of it. The third thing he reproach'd him with was, "That he con-"fess'd twice or thrice before that time, that a man might "be saved in observing the orders of the Church, esta-"blish'd by the laws of the land, and in consequence there-"upon, he charg'd him with the vanity and fruitlesness "of seeking farther Reformation: adding, moreover, that "in the greatest matters he and others contended for, "they were of the same opinion, that the Papists were "of." I have the rather inserted this, that it may be seen what *an exact Logician* this Bishop was. The Puritans did not damn those who complied punctually with the orders of the Church, and therefore, according to this man's logic, they were *vain in seeking farther Reformation.* When Mr. *Cartwright* was about to answer this silly invective of the Bishop, Sir *John Popham*, interrupted him, and began another: upbraiding him with acting against the peace of the land, because that upon conceits of his own head, and yet under colour of conscience, they refus'd things, that had been receiv'd for laws of a long time: and he farther alledg'd, he had offended against the justice of the land, in refusing the oath tendred him.* Then the Bishop requir'd him to take the oath, *Cartwright* desir'd he might answer to the grievous charges laid against him by the Attorney, and especially by the Bishop. But the Bishop, conscious no doubt of the weakness and impertinence of his own discourse, told him he should not answer to any thing, but only to the oath, whether he would take it to answer to the Articles. *Cartwright* hereupon complain'd, 'twas a hard course to *give open charges*, and the same very grievous, and yet *to shut men from all answer* to them. † But still the Bishop insisted upon his first answering touching the oath. Mr. *Cartwright* then produc'd a paper in answer to the Articles, offering to swear to the truth of it. He refus'd any further answer; and said, he look'd upon his refusal warranted by the laws of God and the land. Dr. *Lewin*, upon Mr.

* *Page* 310. † 311.

Mr. *Cartwright*'s calling this oath, the oath *ex officio*, told him he was greatly deceiv'd; becauſe it was deriv'd from the authority of the prince by a delegate power unto them. *Cartwright* anſwer'd: Firſt, That in calling it an oath *ex officio*, he did it by warrant of the court, for the Biſhop had call'd it ſo himſelf, and another of the High Commiſſion, not then preſent, had call'd it the *oath of Inquiſition*: the moſt proper name of it without all queſtion. The Biſhop denied that he had done ſo. But, Mr. *Cartwright* appealing to thoſe preſent, he was ſilent. Secondly, Mr. *Cartwright* alledg'd, he had ſeen Commiſſions from her Majeſty, wherein there was no mention of proceeding by corporal oath. Dr. *Bancroft* own'd this of former Commiſſions, but ſaid the High Commiſſion had been alter'd. Upon this happen'd a jarr between the Doctor and the Biſhop; the Biſhop pretending it had been always in the Commiſſion for thirty years, while he was in Commiſſion himſelf. For the Biſhop ſeem'd to fear, leſt the Commiſſioners always uſing the oath, without warrant, ſhould be in a *Premunire*. And ſince this was the real caſe, how arbitrary and tyrannical had the Biſhop and other Commiſſioners been in all their proceedings? Mr. *Cartwright* farther inſiſted, that tho' they might, by virtue of the Commiſſion, proceed by oath; yet it follow'd not they might do it without any to accuſe, without any limitation, without reaſonable time of deliberation and advice what to anſwer. There were many other impertinent cavils uſed by the Commiſſioners, to which Mr. *Cartwright* anſwer'd with marvellous judgment and modeſty. I will however tranſcribe one part more of the examination, becauſe it tends to clear the proceedings of the Puritans. The Attorney charg'd Mr. *Cartwright* and others with holding conferences and making laws. " Mr. *Cartwright* anſwer'd: That, touching that " point, his anſwer was before them, which (being requi- " red) he would confirm upon his oath: that is, that they " never held conferences by any authority, nor ever made " any laws by any manner of compulſion, to procure any " obedience unto them. Alſo, that he and others had ex- " preſly teſtified by ſubſcription, they would not ſo much " as voluntarily and by mutual agreement, one without " another, practiſe any advice or agreement, that was con- " trary to any law of the land. Whereunto Dr. *Bancroft* " replied: That authority they had none, and therefore " could not uſe it; and compulſion needed not, ſeeing

" every

" every one, receiv'd to their conferences, muſt ſubſcribe " to all orders he and others ſhould ſet down; ſo far as if " they ſhould ſet down the ſenſe or interpretation of a " place of Scripture, it ſhould not be lawful for any to " depart from that: which, ſaid he, is depos'd by three or " four. But, ſaid Mr. *C.* he might have eccleſiaſtical ju- " riſdiction of reproof, ſuſpenſion, excommunication, de- " gradation, as they had been openly, but moſt untruly, " charg'd to have done, if either he, or others with him, " had thought it lawful for them ſo to do. And for the " other point, of their requiring ſubſcription by any that " was admitted, much leſs ſuch a ſubſcription as Dr. *B.* " ſpake of, he proteſted, that neither had he ſo done, " nor any that he knew: and that he was ready to make " that alſo good upon oath." * When they had done bandying about the oath, and the Biſhop, upon his refuſal to take the oath, had commanded an act thereof to be enter'd, Mr. *C.* put the Biſhop in mind of his promiſe, of leave to anſwer the charges which were given againſt him. The Biſhop anſwer'd; he had no leiſure to hear his anſwer, and if he would anſwer, he ſhould do it by a private Letter to him. By which it appears, the Biſhop's conſcience was much of a ſize with his logic. For what ſignify'd the defence of a private Letter, againſt a charge before ſuch company?

Upon this occaſion King *James* wrote a Letter to the Queen in their behalf, which was in theſe words: " Right Excellent, High and Mighty Princeſs, our dea- " reſt Siſter and Couſen, In our heartieſt manner we re- " commend us unto you. Hearing of the apprehenſion " of Mr. *Udal* and Mr. *Cartwright*, and certaine other " Miniſters of the Evangel, within your realme, of whoſe " good erudition and fruitful travells in the Church we " have a very credible commendation, howſoever that " their diverſitie from the Biſhops, and others of your " Clergy, in matters touching them in conſcience, hath " bin a mean by their delation to work them your miſli- " king; at this time we cannot (weighing the duty " which we owe to ſuch as are afflicted for their conſci- " ence in that profeſſion) but by our moſt effectuous and " earneſt Letter interpone us at your hands to any harder " uſage

* *Page* 315.

" uſage of them for that cauſe: requeſting you moſt " earneſtly, that for our cauſe and interceſſion it may " pleaſe you to let them be relieved of their preſent ſtraite, " and whatſoever further accuſation, or purſuite depending " on that ground, reſpecting both their former merit, " in ſetting forth of the Evangel, the ſimplicitie of their " conſcience in this defence, which cannot well be their " let by compulſion, and the great ſlander which could " not faile to fall out upon their further ſtraiting for any " ſuch occaſion, which we aſſure us your zeal to religion, " beſides the expectation we have of your good will to " pleaſure us, will willingly accord to our requeſt, having " ſuch proofes from time to time of our like affection to " you, in any matters which you recommend unto us. " And thus Right Excellent, Right High and Mighty " Princeſs, our dear Siſter and Cozen, we commit you to " God's good protection. From *Edenborough* the 12th " day of *June*, 1591." *

So great was the reputation of theſe Miniſters, both for learning and piety, that even a King, the wiſe *Solomon*, as the flattering Clergy uſed afterwards to call him, was not aſham'd to intercede in their behalf: and indeed, this was not the firſt Letter he wrote to Queen *Elizabeth* upon that occaſion. For Mr. *Udal*, who is mention'd in this Letter, ſays, he had writ once before in his behalf, when he was cloſe priſoner. † But notwithſtanding the King's interceſſion, *Cartwright* continu'd ſometime a priſoner; nor do I find that any favour was ſhewn to the other Miniſters, and particularly to Mr. *Udal*. In their proceedings againſt whom, they acted with ſuch horrid injuſtice and cruelty, that no trial I ever met with, ſince Queen *Mary*'s days, comes near it; no, not the illegal proceedings in King *Charles* the Second, or King *James* the Second's reign. I ſhall therefore be a little more large in giving an account of it. But firſt let us hear what our Author ſays.

Udal, *another Puritan Miniſter, being convicted of writing againſt the Queen's eccleſiaſtical juriſdiction, which was made Felony by a temporary Act of that Queen's reign, was likewiſe condemn'd; but was pardon'd by the interceſſion of Archbiſhop* Whitgift. ‖ I

* Udal's Tryal. Heylyn *gives an imperfect Copy*, Hiſtor. Presbyt. *p.* 316.
† Udal's Tryal, *p.* 42 ‖ *p.* 32.

I have now *Udal's Trial* before me, and from thence ſhall give an account of him. Mr. *Udal* then was indeed one of the Puritan Miniſters, and had been Preacher at *Kingſton* upon *Thames*. There he was ſilenc'd by the Official Dr. *Hone*, for what reaſon he ſays, he could not tell, nor imagine, ſaving the ſecret ſuggeſtions of Mr. *Harvie*. I gueſs therefore by this, there were then ſome illegal underhand dealings againſt him. After he was ſilenc'd, he reſted about half a year, preparing himſelf to a private life, for that he ſaw ſo little hope of returning to his miniſtry, or any reſt in it to the good of the Church. But ſome good people, at *Newcaſtle* upon *Tyne*, prevail'd with the Earl of *Huntington*, to ſend him to them. Accordingly he went, and join'd with two more godly Miniſters, and found their labours were very uſeful. When he had ſtaid a year there, the plague being very ſevere, all the while in the town, (which carry'd off 2000 inhabitants) he was fetch'd thence by Letters from the Lord *Hunſdon*, Lord Chamberlain, in the name of the whole Council. He ſet out *December* 29, 1589, in the foreſt weather that could be, and had a ſad journey, but got ſafe to *London*, *January* 9. And on the 13th he appear'd at the Lord *Cobham's* houſe, before the Lord *Cobham*, Lord *Buckhurſt*, Lord Chief Juſtice *Anderſon*, Dr. *John Young* Biſhop of *Rocheſter*, Mr. *Forteſcue*, Mr. *Egerton*, the Queen's Solicitor, Dr. *Aubery*, and Dr. *Lewin*. I am careful to ſet down their names, that they may be remember'd, as they deſerve. The Biſhop ask'd him, whether he had the allowance of the Biſhop of the Dioceſs to go to *Newcaſtle? Udal* told him, there was no Biſhop at that time in that Dioceſs. Then ſays the Biſhop you ſhould have gone to the Archbiſhop. But, ſays *Udal*, there was no Archbiſhop at *York* neither. This matter then drop'd; tho' afterward Mr. *Forteſcue*, thinking he could cramp him, brought it about again. You are, ſays he, very cunning in the law; I pray you, by what law did you preach at *Newcaſtle*, being forbidden at *Kingſton?* To which *Udal* anſwer'd; he knew no law againſt it, ſeeing it was the Official, Dr. *Hone*, who ſilenc'd him, whoſe authority reached not out of his Archdeaconry. And ſo there was an end of that matter, which was too impertinent to have been ſtarted, but only as they would have been glad of any occaſion of worrying him. Then the Lord Chief Juſtice *Anderſon* told him, he was call'd thither to

anſwer concerning certain books thought to be of his writing. He told them, if it was any of *Martin*'s books (as my Lord Chamberlain's Letters imported) he had clear'd himſelf at *Lambeth* a year and a half before, from being the author of them. Then was he queſtion'd, whether he was the author of the *Demonſtration*, or *Dialogue*. To which he refus'd to anſwer. When he was ask'd, why he would clear himſelf of *Martin*, and not of theſe: he ſaid, becauſe he would not be thought to handle the cauſe of diſcipline as *Martin* did; but he thought otherwiſe of the books mention'd, and car'd not tho' they ſhould be father'd upon him. He ſaid likewiſe, he thought the author, for any think he knew, did well, and he knew he was inquir'd after to be puniſh'd: and therefore he thought it his duty to hinder the finding him out, which he could not better do than thus; for if every one ſuſpected deny'd it, the author at length muſt needs be found out. The Lord *Anderſon* then urg'd him: why dare you not confeſs it, if you be the author of it? dare you not ſtand to your own doings? To this he thus anſwer'd: I profeſs'd before, that I liked of the books, and the matter handled in them, but whether I made them or no, I will not anſwer; neither of any other book of that argument, whatſoever goeth without name, if you ſhould ask me, for the reaſon alledg'd before: beſides that, if I were the author, I think that by law I need not anſwer. That is true, ſays *Anderſon*, if it concern'd the loſs of your life. [Oh barbarous wickedneſs! to urge and ſcrew him by ſuch arts as theſe to witneſs againſt himſelf, and to inſinuate the matter did not touch his life, when the deſign was to try him for his life, as they afterwards did, and condemn'd him!] Well *Udal* anſwer'd him thus: I pray your Lordſhip, doth not the law ſay generally: *No man ſhall be put to anſwer without preſentment, before Juſtices, or matter of record, or by due proceſs and writ original*, &c. A. 42. *Edw.* 3. cap. 3. That is law, ſays *Anderſon*, and it is not law. I underſtand you not, my Lord, *ſays Udal*. 'Tis a Statute which is in force, if it be not repeal'd. And ſo that Lord's mouth was ſtop'd for a while, and he was reliev'd by ſome of his auxiliaries. The Biſhop of *Rocheſter* thought to catch him, by ſaying to him: I pray you let me ask you a queſtion or two concerning your book. [Which was malicious enough in a Biſhop, who ſhould not make it his buſineſs to hunt for the Blood of the innocent.] But *Udal* was upon his guard, and ſaid: 'Tis not

not yet prov'd to be mine; but I will answer to any thing concerning the matter of the book so far as I know.

At length the solicitor said to him: Mr. *Udal*, I am sorry that you will not answer, nor take an oath, which by law you ought to do [he did not mention what law.] I can assure you, your answers are like the seminary Priests answers; for they say, there is no law to compel them to take an oath to accuse themselves.* Sir, says *Udal*, if it be a liberty by law, there is no reason why they should not challenge it: for (tho' they be very bad ones) they are subjects, and untill they be condemn'd by law, may require all the benefit of subjects; neither is that any reason, that their answering so, should make the claim of less value for me, seeing that we are herein subjects alike, tho' otherwise of a most contrary disposition. The Solicitor being thus put to silence, after a short consultation held among themselves, a Civilian undertakes him, this was Dr. *Aubery Lewin*, who said to him: You have taken the oath heretofore, why should you not take it now? *Udal* answer'd him to this: Indeed you call to remembrance a good reason to refuse it. I was call'd to answer certain Articles upon mine oath heretofore, which I voluntarily did, and freely confess'd that against my self concerning my judgment and preaching of the points of discipline, which could never have been prov'd. And when my friends labour'd to have me restor'd to my place, the Archbishop answer'd there was sufficient matter against me by my own confession, why I should not be restor'd; whereupon I covenanted with mine own heart, never to be mine own tormenter in that sort again. At length the Bishop told him, his sentence for that time was to go to the *Gatehouse* close prisoner.

So much good sense and integrity appears in all his answers, that one can't think of the base usage he found without indignation. Take it in his own words: "I was carried to the *Gatehouse* by a Messenger, who deliver'd me "with a warrant to be kept close prisoner, and not to be "suffer'd to have pen, ink or paper, or any body to speak "with me. Thus I remain'd there half a year; in all which "time my wife could not get leave to come unto me, saying "only that in the hearing of the keeper she might speak

* Udal's *reply to this may serve for a solid answer to a suggestion of Bishop Aylmer, I mention'd before in the third part of his invective against* Cartwright.

" to me, and I to her, of such things as he should think " meet; notwithstanding that she made suit to the Com- " missioners, yea unto the body of the Council, for some " more liberty: all which time my Chamber-fellows " were seminary Priests, traitors and professed Papists. " At the end of half a year I was removed to the *White* " *Lyon* in *Southwark*, and so carried to the assizes at " *Croyden*."

The 24 of *July* he was brought to *Croyden* together with the Felons and other criminals, and with fetters upon his legs, to be tried before Baron *Clarke* and Serjeant *Puckering*. The judge used him very rudely, and hardly. When Mr. *Udal* told him, he was ignorant of the law in the matter of challenging a jury, and ask'd how many he might challenge: he answer'd him; he was not to tell him that, he sat there to judge, and not to give counsel. And yet with us the judge is reckon'd to be council for the accused, till he is found guilty; and tis a very common thing in trials for the judges to inform persons in this matter. Mr. *Daulton*, who was council for the Queen, began with a long speech, wherein he inveigh'd against the cause, and those who profes's'd it, and especially Mr. *Udal*; he mention'd some of their books of Common-prayer, and said there was in one of them horrible blasphemy in those words of the consecration of the Lord's Supper: *Take eat this is my b dy, drink this is my blood.** And whereas, says he, one of the books doth allow, that over every congregation there should be a faithful Pastor, that is, a shepherd, whereby they may take the government out of her Majesty's hands, and so bring her Majesty to be one of their sheep; no, quoth he, her Majesty is no sheep under any shepherd in the world, except Christ.† And for the government that these men do seek for, I am assured there is none such to be found in the Word of God. Mr. *Udal* answer'd, this being yet a controversy among learned Divines, he thought it would have been a part of modesty for Mr. *Daulton* to have suspended his judgment, especially since he formerly shew'd some liking to that cause himself. Then the judge took him

* *By this the wisdom or honesty of the man, who was the great manager of his tryal, may be easily discern'd.* † *This is an odd whim enough; but if Queen* Elizabeth *thought so, I wonder why she would take a Dispensation from the Archbishop to eat flesh in Lent.*

him up thus: Sirra, ſirra, anſwer to the matter Mr. *Daulton* hath againſt you: and then bid Mr. *Daulton* proceed to the proof of the points in the indictment. Mr. *Daulton* then undertook to prove,

1. That he had a malicious intent in making the book.
2. That he was the author of it.
3. That theſe matters in the indictment were felony by the Statute of *Eliz.* 23. *cap.* 2.

Then Mr. *Beadle* the Regiſter was ſworn, that the examinations [about to be read] were as the parties themſelves deliver'd them. [For you muſt know they did not ſtand upon the trifling formality of bringing his accuſers to his face.] Then *Stephen Chatfield*'s articles were produc'd againſt him. Theſe were articles which *Chatfield* had carry'd to the Archbiſhop, and contain'd a report of certain written papers he ſaw in Mr. *Udal*'s ſtudy, tending (as he ſuppos'd) to the making ſuch a book as this. Upon ſeeing them he asked, whoſe writing they were: and Mr. *Udal* anſwer'd, a friend's. *Chatfield* then deſir'd him to rid his hands of them, for he doubted they concern'd the ſtate. He ſaid too, that another time *Udal* ſhould tell him: That if they put him to ſilence, he would give the Biſhops ſuch a blow as they never had. *Chatfield* was call'd for to witneſs theſe things, but appear'd not. *Daulton* ſaid he went out of the way on purpoſe. The judge ſaid: Mr. *Udal*, you are glad of that. Mr. *Udal* anſwer'd: My Lords, I wiſh heartily he had been here, for as I am ſure he never could ſay any thing againſt me to prove this point; ſo I have heard, and am able to prove it to be true, that he is very ſorry he ever made any complaint againſt me, confeſſing he did it in his anger, when *Martin* came firſt out; and by their ſuggeſtions, whom he hath proved ſince by experience to be very bad men. He added: He was accuſed two years before upon *Chatfield*'s words, that the papers he ſaw in his ſtudy were the matter of *Martin Mar-prelate*, and becauſe he had clear'd himſelf of that, the ſame thing was now brought to prove another matter, but it proved nothing unleſs it were ſet down in particular what they were. Mr. *Daulton* ſaid, it prov'd he had a purpoſe to write this book, and thoſe things were collections from his friends and preparations thereto. Mr. *Udal* refer'd it [as one would think he might ſafely] to the jury to conſider how that point was clear'd. Beſides, he added, the book itſelf

was extant in men's hands before his talk with *Chatfield*. Then he desir'd he might explain his own words *of giving a blow to the Bishops*. But the judge told him, the matter was clear, they saw what he could say to it well enough, and bid Mr. *Daulton* proceed to the proof of the second point. [This is such evidence, as a man would not hang a dog upon. Here was no witness in court, only a paper read, which had never been sworn to, nothing particular mention'd in the papers alledg'd to be seen, and these are pretended to have been preparations for a book, that was in print before, and all this only the supposition of an angry man (set on by bad men) and who was sorry for what he had done. What a judge then was this Baron *Clarke?* The justice of the nation was then at as low an ebb, as the sacred ministry.]

Then Mr. *Daulton* endeavour'd to prove him the author of the book; and for that end read the answer of *Nicolas Thompkins*, made upon oath before the High Commissioners: That he knew Mr. *Udal* was the author of that book, call'd *The Demonstration*, for he said that Mr. *Udal* himself told him so; also that he saw either in Mr. *Udal*'s house, or in some other place in *Kingston*, a catalogue of all the books Mr. *Udal* had made, amongst which the *Demonstration* was one. This *Thompkins* was beyond sea, and hardly knew what he said when he was examin'd; and own'd he could not for a thousand pounds affirm any more, than that he heard *Udal* say: *He would not doubt but set his name to the book, if he had indifferent judges.* And when witnesses offer'd to prove he had differently reported his confession, they were answer'd: That *because their witness was against the Queen's Majesty they could not be heard.* [The judge no doubt saw how impertinent these things were, and therefore to prejudice the jury against him, offer'd *Udal* to discharge him, if he would swear he made not the book; which he knew he would not do.]

Another evidence he was the author of the book was read; and that was the confession of *Henry Sharpe*, of *Northampton*, who, upon his oath before my Lord Chancellor, had said, that he heard Mr. *Penry* say, that Mr. *Udal* was the author of the *Demonstration*.

This was the whole evidence, upon which he was condemn'd. And besides, the statute was made against Papists, and could not, without a violent straining, be extended

tended to such a case as this: it was against *those, who were evil affected to her Highness*, as all the writings of the Puritans shew, they were not: besides, the Act was levell'd against *defaming of the Queen's Majesty, or stirring up of insurrection, sedition, or rebellion.* Now here was nothing in the book, upon which such a charge, against Mr. *Udal*, could be grounded, supposing he had own'd himself the author of it. Let but any man read the words, upon which the indictment was laid: "And "who can (without blushing) denie you (the Bishops] "to be the cause of all ungodlines, seeing your govern- "ment is that which giveth leave to a man to be any "thing, saving a sound Christian? For certainly it is "more free in these days, to be a Papist, Anabaptist, of "the Family of Love, yea, any most wicked one what- "soever, then that which we should be; and I could "live these twenty years any such in *Englande* (yea in a "Bishop's house, it may be) and never be much molest- "ed for it; so true is that which you are charged with, "in a *Dialogue* lately come foorth against you, and since "burned by you, that you care for nothing but the "maintenance of your dignities, bee it to the damnation "of your owne soules, and infinite millions moe." And what is here to defame the Queen's Majesty (who is not so much as mention'd) or to stir up sedition or rebellion? The judge told the jury, they must find him author of the book, the evidences being manifest for it.

As to the matter of felony, that was a point of law, agreed upon by all the judges. And so the jury brought him in guilty, to the everlasting reproach of the justice of the nation, and particularly of that reign, and of the Bishops, who were the great stirers in the prosecution, for the sake of their own reputation.

The jury having found him guilty, sentence was not pass'd upon him, 'till *Febr.* 20. when the next assize was held in *Southwark*. In the mean while, he drew up a Petition to the Queen, wherein he protests before God, he had never any thought, or imagination, to publish, write, or do any thing maliciously, or tending to the dishonour, or slander of her Majesty's Royal Person, or Princely Estate: and after having earnestly intreated her gracious pardon, promises, if he might obtain it, to lead the rest of his life in all humble and dutiful obedience.

The first day of the assize he was dealt with by some to condemn the book in question, and justify the Hierarchy. This he would not, and at a private hearing, he drew out a paper of reasons to move his judges to stay the sentence, notwithstanding the verdict against him, and to be a means of his release. He herein pleaded his own cause very ingeniously and strenuously; and took notice, the jury were only directed to find him the author of the book, and were freed from inquiring into the intent, without which there is no felony. He appeal'd to their own consciences, whether by themselves, or report, they could find him guilty of any act in his whole life, that savour'd of malice, or malicious intent, against her Majesty, or of any other behaviour, than standeth with the allegiance and duty of a most dutiful and Christian subject. He complain'd, his jury were not left wholly to their own consciences, but were wrought upon partly by promise, assuring them it should be no further danger to him, but tend to his good; and partly by fear; and it had been occasion of grief to some of them ever since: that no witness did directly prove him the author of the book; and that *Chatfield*, the chief witness was so griev'd, that he was asham'd to come where he was known. That the book spake honourably of her Majesty every where, and the drawing of the Statute from her Majesty to the Bishops (as a part of her body politic) was a violent depraving and wresting it. In fine he pleaded, he had maintain'd a cause, wherein all the Foreign Protestants agreed. He clos'd all with this sentence: " If all this prevail not, yet " my redeemer liveth, to whom I commend my self, and " say as sometime *Jeremy* said in a case not much unlike: " *Behold I am in your hands, do with me what seemeth good* " *unto you; but know you this, that if you put me to death,* " *you shall bring innocent blood upon you, and upon the land.* " *As the blood of* Abel, *so the blood of* Udal *will cry to* " *God with a loud voice, and the righteous judge of the* " *world, will require it at the hands of all those that shall* " *be guilty of it.*"

After he had pleaded his reasons in open court, where he was used with barbarous injustice, *Puckering* pass'd sentence of death upon him.

The Queen repriev'd him, and sent Dr. *Bond*, her Chaplain, to him, to offer him a form of submission, which he refus'd, and drew up another of his own. In the

the mean while he receiv'd advice, that ſome about the Queen inform'd her, he held ſuch opinions, as render'd him not worthy to live; and that Sir *Walter Rawleigh* was in hopes of obtaining his life, if he would ſend him ſomewhat under his hand, concerning theſe opinions. This he did, and ſent it in a handſome Letter to Sir *Walter*. After this, Dean *Nowel*, and Dr. *Andrews*, came and brought him a form of ſubmiſſion, promiſing in the name of the Council, he ſhould have pardon and liberty, if he ſubſcrib'd it. He refus'd at firſt, but afterwards, upon adviſing with his friends, yielded; and that this might not be miſconſtrued, he ſent a Letter to the Lords of the Council, telling them honeſtly, how he would be underſtood, as to ſeveral paſſages in it. Soon after came Dr. *Andrews* to him, telling him, the Clark had miſtaken the form of ſubmiſſion, and brought him another, which was moſtly the ſame he had refus'd before. And ſoon after he heard, that that ſubmiſſion *Nowel* had procur'd of him, was made uſe of to haſten the execution of the ſentence. Upon which he wrote a plain Letter to him, ſetting before him the danger of having a hand in ſhedding his innocent blood, and intreating him to act in his behalf; at the ſame time, ſhewing he was not afraid to die, even ſuch a manner of death. He continued in priſon, without being allow'd to go to Church, and in *Eaſter Term*, 1592, he ſued for liberty for that; but was deny'd, being a condemn'd man, and then he got a copy of his indictment, which he could not obtain before.

Upon this he got a pardon fram'd, according to the indictment, and ſent it with a Petition by his wife to the Council, who refer'd him to the Archbiſhop. *Udal* then ſent divers Petitions, and dutiful Letters to him, and got many friends and honourable perſonages to ſue to him; yet could not his good will be gotten. The *Turky* Merchants then ſued, they might have him to *Guinea*, to teach their people: the Archbiſhop promis'd his good will, provided they would be bound for his going upon his having his liberty. But afterwards he added another condition, that they ſhould be bound, he ſhould tarry there, 'till her Majeſty's licence to come thence. This condition was refus'd. However at length Dean *Nowel* prevail'd with the Lord Keeper, and the Archbiſhop promiſed, at their next meeting at court, to deal with her Ma-

Majesty to sign his pardon, that he might have his liberty to go the voyage. Whether they did this, or no, does not appear. If *Fuller* is to be believ'd, he was not pardon'd at all, but dy'd a prisoner. Whether he had fairer play in the prison, than in the court, I can't tell. However there is good reason to think, that his imprisonment, and the great vexation he met with, were the means of hastening his death. And so we leave his, with the other *souls, under the altar, crying with a loud voice, and saying, How long, Lord, holy and true, dost thou not judge and avenge our blood on them that dwell on the earth?*

I cannot here but take notice of a great mistake of Sir *George Paul*, who, extolling the Archbishop for his *mildness and clemency*, (and he might as well have done it for his *Nonconformity*) speaks thus of him: "Did he "not, after that *Udal* and others were condemned unto "death, draw upon him the dislike of his dear and ho- "nourable friend, in making earnest suit, and never cea- "sed, 'till he had obtain'd pardon for them at her Maje- "sty's hands?" * The *honourable friend* is mention'd by name in the Margin, Sir *Christopher Hatton*, who was Queen *Elizabeth*'s Chancellor. Now how false this is, concerning *Udal*, may appear by what *Udal* himself writes of the matter. He tells us expressly: That *after the Chancellor's death*, he sent several times to the Archbishop, and that his good will could not be gotten. How then could the Archbishop draw upon him *Hatton*'s dislike, by suing for his pardon? This I mention the rather, that my readers may be sensible, how little credit is to be given to that author. And what is it makes our Adversaries wriggle after this rate, and be so solicitous to save the credit of their Archbishop? If *Udal* was prov'd guilty, and his crime was capital, what harm had there been in it, if the Archbishop had never stir'd to obtain his pardon? But if nothing appear'd against him, and the very matter objected was a meer trifle, I think it would much better become our Adversaries to testify their utter abhorrence of the horrid villany practis'd against an ingenious, learned, and pious Minister, than to forge such sorry excuses and vindications of any, who had a hand in it.

I

* Life of Whitg. *p.* 80.

I confeſs, this account is pretty long, tho' I have, to ſhorten it, left out much I would have been glad to put in; but the extraordinarineſs of the caſe, and the ſcarcity of the trial will, I hope, be a ſufficient apology for me, and eſpecially ſince our Author himſelf led me to ſpeak particularly of it.

Now alſo was ſilenc'd Mr. *Walter Travers*, a very pious and learned Miniſter, whom King *James* had invited, together with Mr. *Cartwright*, to be Profeſſors in the Univerſity of St. *Andrews*. He was not ſuffer'd either to ſee his accuſers, or make any defence for himſelf; but being unheard, was ſilenc'd, and that in the moſt rude and affronting way, that his adverſaries could contrive. For when the congregation was met together on a Lord's Day, and *Travers* was juſt going into the pulpit, a ſorry fellow deliver'd him Archbiſhop *Whitgift*'s Letter, whereby he forbad him to preach. 'Tis paſt doubt the deſign was to provoke him, by thus publicly affronting him before the congregation: but ſome people can't help ſuſpecting, the crafty Archbiſhop had a malicious intention to lay a ſnare for him; and ſought an occaſion of uſing him with the greater ſeverity, if he had leſs regarded the authority of the Archbiſhop, than the profit of the aſſembly, and had therefore diſobey'd ſo unexpected a command. However that be, the Archbiſhop, according to his tender affection to the people, ſent no body to preach in *Travers*'s room; but the congregation, being diſappointed of the expected entertainment, was diſmiſs'd. The Archbiſhop pretended three reaſons for this prohibition. I ſhall only take notice of the firſt, which the Foreign Divines ought to be acquainted with: and that was, that Mr. *Travers* was not a Miniſter, according to the manner of the Church of *England*: for he was not ordain'd by the Archbiſhop, but by the Presbytery at *Antwerp*. This has been the manner of our Adverſaries ſince that time; they null the ordinations of Proteſtants, while they allow the validity of thoſe of Papiſts. Concerning this, Mr. *Hornbeck* ſays: "Nothing is more intolerable, than "that thoſe, who are ordain'd by the Papiſts, ſhould be "receiv'd without any difficulty, becauſe they were or- "dain'd by a Biſhop; and at the ſame time, the orders "of thoſe, who are ordain'd by Presbyters, are call'd in "queſtion: eſpecially, ſince the Presbyterians admit per- "ſons ordain'd by Biſhops in the Proteſtant Church,

"the

" the Bishops, on the other hand, ought not to dispute " against the ordinations perform'd in the same Church " by Presbyters, as tho' it were null and invalid. "

Now our Author proceeds to the story of *Hacket: Nay some of the Puritans*, says he, *of this time, were so mad, as to attempt a rebellion for the sake of the discipline, and by the solicitation of some enthusiastical men*, Hacket, Coppinger, *and* Arthington, *proceeded to stir up the people to take up arms against the Queen on that behalf. Hacket* was a fellow of a bold and confident nature, illiterate to the last degree; for he had never learn'd to read. Dr. *Fuller* hints, that he was thought to be disorder'd in his brain, and was fitter for *Bedlam*, than *Bridewel*. * However that be, 'tis certain he broke out into most horrid blasphemy, and even died with it in his mouth. It would be very unjust to pretend, his being a Nonconformist is an evidence of the badness of our cause. Every one knows, that *Simon Magus*, *Montanus*, and *Marcion*, were once members of the Christian Church, tho' they afterwards fell into the most abominable Heresies. Nay, among the Disciples of our Lord himself, there was a *Judas*, who was a Devil. † The tares will be mix'd with the wheat, until the time of harvest: and 'tis common for wicked men, to seek to hide their wickedness by affecting the company of good men. Nor can our Adversaries boast they are, by any singular privilege, exempted from the like disgrace. We need not descend to the illiterate laity, or their inferior Clergy, to find out instances to reproach them with. We are able to stop the mouths of all such objecters, if they have any modesty, with the vile practices even of some of their own Bishops, and chief rulers of their Church. And if the disgraceful punishment inflicted be thought to encrease the disgrace of a party, we don't want an example of that kind to retort upon our Adversaries. What crime could be viler than that of *Aderton*, Bishop of *Waterford*, for which he was hang'd, and that retaining his sacred character; for he was not first degraded? I would here farther add, that our Author has not fairly represented this matter. These three frantic persons had no body to join with them in their insurrection; nor is there evidence, that any,

* *Book 9. p. 205, 206.* † *John vi. 70.*

any, beſide themſelves, approv'd, or were indeed acquainted with their true deſign.

Dr. *Nichols* tell us: Coppinger *communicated this matter with Mr.* Cartwright, *Mr.* Egerton, *and* Wigginton, *Puritanical Miniſters, who were then at* London, *asking their advice concerning it. But to this they return this cunning anſwer:* " *That it was not to be denied, but that the* " *cauſe was good, which he deſir'd to be an actor in, but* " *the thing which ſtuck was, they thought it impoſſible that* " *he ſhould be fit to intermeddle in it, without endangering* " *both of himſelf and of the real cauſe, which he would ſeem* " *to be moſt deſirous to further. And* Egerton *ſaith: That* " *tho' he would not undertake to approve his extraordinary* " *calling, yet he would be loth to quench the ſpirit of God in* " Coppinger, *or to hinder his zeal.*" *But none of them all thought fit to diſcover his conſpiracy.* How ſhould they diſcover his conſpiracy, who were not acquainted with it? There is no evidence of their acquainting the Miniſters with their deſign of making an inſurrection. They pretended an extraordinary zeal, and that they would exert themſelves for the diſcipline: but did they ever inform them, that they intended to riſe in open rebellion againſt the Queen? Some of the Miniſters took them for men deluded and diſtemper'd in their brains, and anſwer'd them accordingly; perhaps ſo as they hoped was the moſt ready way to get rid of their impertinence. And who ever thinks it worth his while to go and trouble a magiſtrate, with an information about the romantic, rambling diſcourſes of ſuch kind of men? 'Tis poſſible a weak Miniſter (and ſuch there may be in any party) might give an unadvis'd anſwer to them: but that any of them were let into their real deſign is not pretended. And all theſe informations muſt come from thoſe men themſelves, whoſe teſtimony will not be much regarded by prudent men againſt perſons of probity and reputation. And who, that knows any thing of the Puritans, will imagine they would countenance the proclamation that *Coppinger* and *Arthington* made, that Chriſt was come in *Hacket*, with his fan in his hand, *&c.?* Dr. *Fuller* ſpeaks candidly of the matter. " This buſineſs, *ſays he*, of *Hacket* " happen'd very unſeaſonably for the Presbyterians. True " it is, they as cordially deteſted his blaſphemies, as any " of the Epiſcopal party. And ſuch of them as loved " *Hacket* the Nonconformiſt, abhorr'd *Hacket* the Here-

" tic,

" tic, after he had mounted to so high a pitch of impie-
" ty." * And let any man consider the spirit of that reign, and how scandalously they hunted after the blood of *Udal*, and he will reckon it an argument of the Puritans innocence in this affair, or at least an evidence there was no proof against them, that none of them suffer'd for it.

Farther *Cartwright* wrote an *Apology* for himself, against the slanders of Dr. *Sutcliffe*. In which he most fully justifies himself, and shews the weakness of the charges advanc'd by that trifling and impertinent scribler. Particularly he shews, he had never seen *Hacket* or *Arthrington*, and had never any conference with them by letter or message. That as to *Coppinger*, a friend of his had consulted him about his extraordinary calling; and that he gave his reasons to prove it a delusion: that he advis'd his friends, a little before his lew'd practice broke out, to put him in *Bridewell* or *Bedlam*: that when he sent Mr. *Cartwright* a Letter, he would not receive it, or so much as look upon the superscription of it.

Nor was *Cartwright* clear'd by himself only, but by Mr. *Job Throckmorton*, a Gentleman who was falsly accus'd, as being privy to this conspiracy, and therefore wrote an Apology for himself. He says: " A reverend judge in this " land did once tell my Lord Chancellor, that the matter of " the indictment that passed against *Throckmorton* at *War-* " *wick*, was in trueth but a frivelous matter, and a thing " that he would easily avoid. And the said Lord Chancel- " lor did say, not only privately in his house, but even to " her Majesty (who caused the same to be signify'd to me, " that I might therein be thankful to my Lord) and more " than that did openly in Parliament pronounce, that he " knew the same *Job Throckmorton* to be an honest man." Moreover he shews, that the writers concerning that conspiracy had wretchedly wrested his and *Egerton*'s words, to a sense quite different from that of the authors; and had left out such passages of their letters, as would have made their meaning plain. He declares he was caution'd by Mr. *Cartwright* from the very first, to beware of *Coppinger* as of a craz'd man. These, and several other things, which quite destroy the credit of those base and mercena-

ry

* P. 286.

ry writers *Sutcliffe* and *Cosin*, he not only relates, but offers to swear to the truth of them, whenever he should be call'd to it.

Our Author in the next place discourses concerning *Robert Brown*.* Of whom I shall say but little at present, the reports of authors concerning him being so various, that 'tis hard to discern the truth. Nor, do I apprehend the cause of the Dissenters to be much affected with his history. All seem to agree that he was not so fix'd in his notions, but that the persecution of the Bishops made him conform. If he did this sincerely, our Adversaries may triumph in their proselyte; if hypocritically, they may learn what is the great benefit of those persecuting practices they are so fond of; but they are the worst men in the world to become his accusers, because they were first his tempters. The *Independents* do not own him as their ringleader. He is said by a Foreigner to have been a man of a most dissolute conversation, and to have continued Minister of a Parish; which, if it be true, shews our Adversaries are more strict in punishing men for disparaging their constitution, than for transgressing the undoubted laws of Christ. † But 'tis to be hoped, that in a little time we may have a much more full and certain account of him, than we have at present. And that makes me the willinger to pass him over so lightly.

A severe law was made about this time, by which such as should persuade others, or be present themselves at Conventicles, were requir'd to abjure, or otherwise were to be banish'd. Sir *Walter Rawleigh*, when the Bill was read the second time in the House of Commons, spake against it. He said: "In his conceit the Brownists are "worthy to be rooted out of a commonwealth; but "what danger may grow to our selves, if this law passes, "it were fit to be consider'd. For it is to be fear'd, that "men not guilty will be included in it; and that law is "hard that taketh life, or sendeth into banishment, "where mens intentions shall be judg'd by a jury, and "they shall be judges what another meant. But what "law that is against a fact, that is just; and punish the "fact as severely as you will. If two or three thousand "Brownists meet at the seaside, at whose charge shall "they

* *p.* 34. † Honor. Regius de Stat. Eccles. in Anglia.

" they be tranſported? or whither will you ſend them?
" I am ſorry for it; I am afraid there is near twenty thou-
" ſand of them in *England*; and when they are gone,
" who ſhall maintain their wives and children? *

Upon theſe poor people the perſecution was very heavy. The only crime they were guilty of was, their oppoſing vigorouſly the impoſitions of the Hierarchy, and their worſhiping God according to their conſciences. They were indeed very high in their notions about many things, and they commonly wrote with a great deal of bitterneſs; but they were undoubtedly many of them very good men, and far from deſerving any ſuch hard and cruel treatment. The Puritans always diſlik'd the rigidneſs of their notions, and were the chief writers againſt them; for which the Biſhops, according to their uſual gratitude at that time, rewarded them with ſilencing, ſuſpenſion and impriſonment.

In the year 1592. there were fifty ſix of theſe people taken on a Lord's Day as they were worſhiping God, in the very place, in which the Proteſtant congregation us'd to meet in Queen *Mary*'s days. They were ſent two by two into the ſeveral priſons in and about *London*. Some of them by long impriſonment were near ſtarv'd, others after two years impriſonment were baniſh'd, and ſome were hang'd. † There were at that time detain'd in priſons in *London* (beſide thoſe in other goales throughout the land) 72 perſons lying in cold, in hunger, in dungeons, in irons. *Barrow* ſays the 56 taken in *London* were unbailably committed by the Biſhop of *London* cloſe priſoner in *Bridewel*, the *Limbo* or *Dungeon in Newgate*, the *Fleet*, the *Counters*, the *Clink*, the *Gatehouſe*, the *white Lyon*. " Theſe bloody men, *ſays he*, will allow them nei-
" ther meat, drink, fire, lodging, nor ſuffer any, whoſe
" hearts the Lord would ſtir up for their relief, to have
" any acceſs to them: purpoſing belike to impriſon them
" unto death, as they have done 17 or 18 others in the
" ſame noiſom goales within theſe ſix years." The huſband and wife, he tells us, were not ſuffer'd to be in the ſame priſon: their poor families at home were miſerable. " Some of this company, *ſays he*, had not one penny a-
" bout them, when they were ſent into cloſe priſon, nor
" any

* *Townſhend*'s Hiſtorical Collections, *p.* 76. † *Barrow*'s Supplicat. to the Parliam.

" any thing being abroad (which is the caſe of moſt of " them, if not all) to procure themſelves and their poor " families any maintenance, ſave only by their handy la- " bours and trades. Whereby it is come to paſs, that " theſe enemies of God do not only ſtarve and undo a " number of men in the priſons, but even a lamentable " company of poor orphans and ſervants abroad. Their " unbridled ſlanders, their lawleſs privy ſearches, their " violent breaking open and rifling our houſes, their la- " mentable and barbarous uſage of women and young " children in theſe hoſtile aſſaults, their uncontroul'd " thievery, robbing, and taking away of whatſoever they " think meet from us in this caſe; their unappeas'd and " mercileſs purſuit of us from our houſes, trades, wives, " children, eſpecially from the holy ſociety of the ſaints " and Church of God, we are inforc'd to omit, leſt we " ſhould be over tedious.—— We crave for all of us but " the liberty either to die openly, or to live openly in the " land of our nativity. If we deſerve death, it beſeemeth " the Majeſty of juſtice not to ſee us cloſely murder'd, " yea ſtarv'd to death with hunger and cold, and ſtifled " in lothſom dungeons. If we be guiltleſs, we crave but " the benefit of our innocence, *viz.* that we may have " peace to ſerve our God, and our Prince, in the place of " the ſepulchres of our Fathers."

But let us hear what our Author ſays of ſuch, as were put to death upon the account of Browniſm. *One* Thacker *and* Copping *were hang'd for publiſhing* Brown's *Books.** And was not this, do we think, a mighty crime for which men ſhould be hang'd? Was not this a juſtification of the Papiſts putting men to death for the ſame ſort of crimes? This cruelty was practis'd in 1583, ten years before what he next mentions.

Barrow *and* Greewood *ſuffer'd the ſame puniſhment, for putting out Books upon the like principles in defamation of the eſtabliſh'd Church, and for holding ſeparate Meetings contrary to law. But a pardon was offer'd them, if they would promiſe to live quietly for the future, and not diſturb the peace of the Church. But the ſtomachful Schiſmatics choſe death, rather than quiet.* Theſe two Perſons, Mr. *Barrow* a Gentleman, and Mr. *Greenwood* a Miniſter, by their

* *See* Fuller's Church Hiſt. *B.* 9, *p.* 169

whole converſation approv'd themſelves, ſo far as I can find, honeſt and good, tho' weak Chriſtians; nor can their adverſaries find any thing to reproach them with, ſaving their judgment in controverted points about ceremonies, church government, *&c.* And tho' I look upon them to have been extravagantly miſtaken in ſome things, and to have been too ſharp in their ſtile; yet I make no doubt at all, they are now glorious ſaints above. And I muſt own, I cannot, without ſome indignation, think of thoſe men, who ſhed their blood under a pretence of doing God ſervice. Is that the way of confuting arguments, and ſilencing an adverſary? Were not the matters diſputable, and ſuch wherein good men might differ in their ſentiments? If they were in an error, was it not a very tolerable one? Nay were not their adverſaries themſelves in much greater errors even about theſe matters? Was there not good reaſon to think they were honeſt and conſcientious in embracing and profeſſing their opinions? Did not their whole conduct, did not the teſtimony of their blood abundantly confirm it? If they were quite out of the way, was ſuch rigour and cruelty the proper method of convincing and reclaiming them? And is it not ſcandalous in writers after them to inſult theſe men? Can any man be ſo weak, as to think they did not love their lives, as well as their neighbours? Was it any thing but the deſire of keeping a good conſcience, that kept them from accepting an offer'd pardon? Few men are ſtomachful enough ro refuſe their lives, when they are offer'd them; and 'tis barbarous to impute to ſuch a reaſon, what is apparently done for the ſake of a good conſcience. While I am writing this, we have an account of the behaviour of Mr. *Paul*, one of their own Clergy, who tho' he had been in open rebellion, and died vindicating the impudent cauſe for which he ſuffer'd; yet was not ſo *ſtomachful*, but that he could baſely and ſcandalouſly fawn, and flatter, and lie too, as long as he had any hope of ſaving his life. What made the difference between him and them? Certainly not that he was more humble, and they more *ſtomachful*; not that he only lov'd life, and they deſpis'd it; but that the one acted upon no religious principle, as did the other two. And let any man read the examinations of *Barrow* and *Greenwood*, and I am miſtaken, if he will not perceive a plain hearted Chriſtian ſimplicity

plicity in their behaviour, and an inhuman ſpirit of cruelty and tyranny in their perſecutors.

I ſhall farther ſet down here what I meet with in one of their writers, who, in King *James* the Firſt's reign, publiſh'd *Barrow's Platform.* " A Gentleman, *Jays he*, of " a good houſe told me, that Queen *Elizabeth* asked the " learned Doctor *Raynolds*, what he thought of thoſe two " men. And he anſwer'd her Majeſty, that it could not " avail any thing to ſhew his judgment concerning them, " ſeeing they were put to death: and being loth to ſpeak " his mind further, her Highneſs charged him upon his " allegiance to ſpeak. Whereupon he anſwer'd: That he " was perſuaded, if they had lived, they would have " been two as worthy inſtruments for the Church of God, " as have been rais'd up in this age. Her Majeſty ſigh'd, " and ſaid no more. But after that, riding to a park by " the place, where they were executed, call'd to mind " their ſuffering of death, and (being willing to take fur- " ther information concerning them) demanded of the " Right Honourable the Earl of *Cumberland* (that was " preſent when they ſuffer'd) what end they made. He " anſwer'd: *A very godly end, and prayed for your Maje-* " *ſty, the ſtate*, &c. Moreover Mr. *Philips*, a Preacher " famous, having both heard and ſeen Mr. *Barrow*, his " holy ſpeeches and preparation for death, ſaid: *Barrow*, " *Barrow, my ſoul be with thine.* For thus I have been " credibly inform'd. " Mr. *Strype* tells us, that pardon was promis'd them, if they would have come to Church, but that the great thing that ſtuck with them was, the doctrine of Chriſt's deſcent into hell; which was mightily inſiſted on at that time, and was the occaſion of much ſuffering to good men. *

Dr. *Nichols*, in the next place, brings in *Barrow* under ſentence of condemnation, as making a heavy complaint of *Cartwright's* refuſing to come to him. This ſtory, tho' related by ſome writers, is not very probable. The *Browniſts* were pretty much alienated from the Puritans, who wrote againſt them, and perhaps more than they ought: and whatever uſe they might make of *Cartwright's* principles, yet he never approv'd their doings, or gave them any encouragement. Indeed he, and the Puritans

* *See* Aylmer's Life, p. 247.

ritans in general, seem'd to be too much of Dr. *Nichols*'s mind, concerning the Magistrate's power in matters of religion. And considering what treatment *Cartwright* had met with, no one can blame him for being on his guard. He was offended with the satyrical stile of many writings publish'd at that time, by the enemies of the ecclesiastical constitution, as Mr. *Clark* assures us, and *Cartwright* himself testifies in his *Apology*. And Dr. *Fuller* says that tho' some thought those jeering pens well employ'd; yet "the more discreet and devout sort of men, even of "such as were no great friends to the Hierarchy, upon "solemn debate then resolv'd (I speak, *says he*, on cer- "tain knowledge from the mouths of such whom I must "believe) that for many foul falshoods therein suggested, "such books were altogether unbeseeming a pious spirit, "to print, publish, or with pleasure peruse, which "suppos'd true both in matter and measure, charity would "rather conceal than discover." * And if *Cartwright* suspected *Barrow* to have a hand in any such pieces, and knew at the same time how carefully his adversaries watch'd for an opportunity against him, he must be thought to have acted prudently in avoiding (if he did avoid) a conversation they would have improv'd against him. If he had done otherwise 'tis possible all the blame might have been laid upon him, and he afresh have been cast into prison. So impossible is it for innocence itself to please unreasonable and malicious men.

Soon after these was executed Mr. *John Penry* whom our Author mentions before, saying, *He was one of the compesers of that notorious Libel*, Martin Marprelate, and *being found guilty of libelling the Queen, was hang'd.*† Not knowing whether his trial be in print or not, I can't so well judge of the evidence alledg'd to prove him the author of *Martin Marprelate*. And beside the assertions of that party that shed his blood, I have met with nothing to induce me to believe it. And Mr. *Udal*, who was well acquainted with him, declar'd he did not believe *Penry* was the author: and indeed what I have read of *Penry*, appears to me to be written with an intirely different stile and temper from *Martin Marprelate*. The government seems never to have had any certain information of the true

* *Book 5. p. 193.* † *p. 32.*

true author; and perhaps 'twas known then to very few, if any beſide the author himſelf. But if he were not the author, ſome mens malice againſt the party was gratified in putting him to death. Another thing I would take notice of is: That our Author ſays, he was *found guilty of libelling the Queen:* whereas, I dare ſay, there is not any ſuch thing in any of *Martin's* writings. Satyrical enough they are upon the Biſhops and Clergy of the Church. But what was ſaid againſt them is violently ſtrain'd to be againſt the Queen, becauſe they were her Miniſters. But that he never entertain'd any deſigns againſt the Queen, or bore her any diſreſpect, appears by what he ſays at his examination before Juſtice *Fanſhaw*, and Juſtice *Young*. For a man who was ſo honeſt and free to declare his mind, in ſeveral things, which he could not but know would be improv'd againſt him, deſerves to be believ'd in thoſe declarations he makes for his own vindication. When Mr. *Fanſhaw* ſaid to him: "Then you are privy unto no "practice or intent of any ſedition or commotion againſt "her Majeſty, or the ſtate, for the pulling down of Bi-"ſhops? Mr. *Penry* anſwer'd him: No, I thank God, "nor ever was; and I proteſt before heaven and earth, "that if I were, I would diſcloſe and withſtand the ſame "to the uttermoſt of my ability, in all perſons of what "religion ſoever they were." * Afterward Mr. *Fanſhaw* put him in mind, he had ſaid, that the offices and livings he conceiv'd to be deriv'd from the body of Antichriſt ſhould be overthrown by the Lord, and therefore deſir'd to know how he meant this ſhould be accompliſh'd. And then *Penry* ſaid thus: "I have already ſhew'd you, that "this work ſhall be done by the appearing of Jeſus Chriſt, "in the ſhining brightneſs of his Goſpel, thro' the effica-"cy whereof, the Lord ſhall ſo lay them open, as he will "put it into the hearts of princes and ſtates, wherein they "are now maintain'd, to aboliſh their offices, callings and "works utterly from among men, and to employ their "livings unto the holy civil uſes of the princes and ſtates "wherein they are."

And in a declaration he drew up, concerning his allegiance and his faith, which has many things that are found in his examination, he profeſſes as ample an allegi-

* See the Examinat. of Barrow, Greenwood and Penry, *p.* 34.

ance as any Christian, for ought I see, can rightfully do; and declares himself most willing to defend her Majesty's authority against all estates, persons, and creatures under heaven, to the loss of his life; adding this honest expression: "And I take the Lord to record, that that day to my "knowledge hath not passed over my head, I am sure, "since the first time that the Lord under her gracious "reign brought me to the knowledge of the truth, where- "in I have not, or do not pray for the blessings of my "God, both outward and inward, to be pour'd with a "full horn upon her Right Excellent Majesty's throne, re- "giment and dominions for ever and ever: and that he "would either convert or speedily overthrow in his wrath "all his and her enemies with their enterprises, whether "they be home or foreign. Hereof I call the searcher of "hearts, as in witness of truth against my own soul, if "either I dissemble or forge in the premises." He afterward professes, that whatever he held in the points controverted, he held it of meer conscience toward God, having the written Word for his warrant. But if any one could convince him by that word, "that he err'd in a- "ny thing, he was willing to reform his judgment, crave "pardon earnestly for his oversight, yea, and be most "willing to suffer due punishment for his temerity. But, "*says he*, if on the other side, I testify nothing but verity "in these points I am undoubtedly persuaded of, I most "humbly crave, that the piercing edge of that sword "may not in heat be turn'd against me and my brethren, "which was never professedly violent against the open "and sworn enemies of their native prince and country." He goes on like a Christian hero: "Death, I thank God, "I fear not, in this cause especially; for I know that the "sting of death is taken away, and that they are blessed "which dy in the Lord for witnessing against the former "corruptions, *Rev.* xiv. 9. 13. Life I desire not, if I "be guilty of sedition, of defaming and disturbing the "quiet state of her Majesty's peaceable government." He concludes with a vein of good sense, one would think above the age he liv'd in. "Lastly, *says he*, I most "humbly and earnestly beseech their Honours and Wor- "ships, in whose hands this writing of mine shall come, "to consider, that 'tis to no purpose that her Majesty's "subjects should bestow their time in learning, in study "and meditation of the word, in reading the writings

"and

" and doings of learned men, and of the holy Martyrs " which have been in former ages, especially the writings " publish'd by her Majesty's authority; if they may not " without danger profess and hold these truths which " they learn out of them, and that in such sort as they " are able to convince all the world that will stand against " them, by no other weapon than by the word of God. " I beseech them also to consider, what a lamentable case " 'tis, that we may hold fellowship with the *Romish* " Church in the inventions thereof without all danger, " and cannot, without extream peril, be permitted in " judgment and practice to dissent from the same, where " it swerveth from the true way. And as they find the " things to be of especial moment in religion, I beseech " them in the bowels of Jesus Christ to be a means unto " her Majesty and their Honours, that my cause may be " weigh'd in even balance. Imprisonments, indictments, " arraignments, yea death itself are no meet weapons to " convince the conscience, grounded upon the word of " God, and accompany'd with so many witnesses of his " famous servants and Churches. "

Dr. *Fuller* mentions three more, who were condemn'd for the like crimes; but says, he supposes they were pardon'd, because he hears nothing of their execution. Wherein I believe he was not mistaken: for I find one, if not two of the same names were afterwards among the exiles at *Amsterdam*. *

I find by a Brownist author, there was one *William Deunys* executed at *Thetford*, in *Norfolk*, for the same crime. When a just and terrible God shall make inquisition for blood, 'tis not hard to know in whose skirts the blood of these men will be found. I should be heartily glad, if I could find our Adversaries of this generation, when they mention these things, would go as far as the *Jews* did, and say: *If we had been in the days of our fathers, we would not have been partakers with them in the blood of* these men. I can't imagine what they mean, who abet these practices, or mention them without a just abhorrence; unless they are willing that upon themselves should come their righteous blood, and the blood of all other good men, who have in like manner been unjustly persecuted unto death.

* *Page* 223.

MDCII. The Puritans, who had endur'd such a long and grievous persecution under Queen *Elizabeth*, were now in great expectation of the long desir'd reformation and peace of the Church, when King *James*, who had interceeded by his Letters for some of the persecuted Ministers, came to the throne.

Dr. *Fuller* places the *Petition*, sign'd by a thousand hands, after the *Hampton Court Conference*; but I am satisfy'd I was mistaken in following him therein. The matter of their petition was digested into four Articles. In the first they desire the Cross in Baptism, the Interrogatories ministred to infants, Confirmation, Baptism ministred by women, the divers terms or *Preists*, *Absolution*, &c. and the Ring in marriage may be laid aside: that the Cap and Surplice, the rest upon Holidays, and the teaching the people to bow at the name of *Jesus*, be not urg'd: that the Service be abridg'd, and Church Music moderated to better edification: that Canonical Scripture be only read in the Church, &c. The second Article was for a diligent preaching Ministery, and against Nonresidence. The third against Pluralities. The last against the notorious abuses of the Spiritual Courts.*

There are very few of these, which would not be grateful to some of the best men in the Church. But the Bishops set themselves obstinately against all alterations, and instead of making things easy to the Petitioners, they seem to have taken their measures in Convocation from the Petition itself, to make the Ministers case more hard and difficult.

Dr. *Nichols* represents *the King*, as *not well pleas'd with these demands*. But Dr. *Fuller* says: "After it was present-"ed, it was given out, that his Majesty lent it a favour-"able ear."† The account I shall give of the Conference at *Hampton Court* will make this latter appear most probable.

Now whereas Dr. *Nichols*, in relating the history of the Conference, follows the false account, given by Bishop *Barlow*; I shall present the reader with a more true and exact one from Mr. *Calderwood*. "Sundry reports, *says* "*he*, went of the Conference, different from that relation, "which is set forth by *Barlow*. I have therefore set down "here

* Church Hist. *B.* 10. *p.* 21. † *Pag.* 40. *p.* 23.

" here that relation, which Mr. *Patrick Galloway* ſent " from *London* to the Presbytery of *Edinburg*, after it was " revis'd by the King himſelf." * Then follows Mr. *Galloway*'s Letter, in which he thus writes :

—— " I receiv'd two of your Letters, one directed to his " Majeſty, and another to my ſelf, for the uſing thereof; the " ſame I read, cloſed, and three days before the Conference " deliver'd it unto his Majeſty's hands, and receiv'd it back " again, after ſome ſhort ſpeeches had upon a word of " your letter, as, *the groſs corruptions of this Church*; which " then was expon'd, and I aſſur'd that all corruptions " diſſonant from the Word, or contrary thereto, ſhould " be amended. The twelfth of *January* was the day of " meeting, at what time the Biſhops, call'd upon by his " Majeſty, were gravely deſir'd to adviſe upon all the cor- " ruptions in this Church, in Doctrine, Ceremonies and " Diſcipline; and as they will anſwer to God in con- " ſcience, and to his Majeſty upon their obedience, that " they ſhould return the third day after, which was *Sa- " turday*. They return'd to his Majeſty, and there ap- " poſed as of before, it was anſwer'd, all was well. And " when his Majeſty in great fervency brought inſtances to " the contrary; they upon their knees with great ear- " neſtneſs crav'd, that nothing ſhould be alter'd; leſt Po- " piſh Recuſants, puniſh'd by penal Statutes for their diſ- " obedience; and the Puritans, puniſh'd by deprivation " from calling and living for Nonconformity, ſhould ſay, " they had juſt cauſe to inſult upon them, as men who " had travell'd to bind them to that, which by their own " mouths now was confeſs'd to be erroneous. † Al- " ways after five hours diſpute had by his Majeſty againſt " them, and his Majeſty's reſolution for Reformation inti- " mated to them, they were diſmiſſed that day. Upon " the 16 of *January*, being Monday, the Brethren were " call'd to his Majeſty, only five of them being preſent, " and with them two Biſhops, and ſix or eight Deans. " Here his Majeſty crav'd to know of them, what they " deſir'd to be reform'd: but it was very looſly and coldly " anſwer'd. This day ended after four hours talking, " and Wedneſday the 18 of *January* was appointed for " the

* Hiſt. of the Ch. of Scotl p. 474. † *Thus did the good Biſhops with their pious care preſer their own honour and reputation to the peace of the Church.*

" the meeting of both parties. Where, as before, the " parties being call'd together, the heads were repeated, " which his Majesty would have reform'd at this time; " and so the whole action ended. Sundry, as they favour'd, " gave out copies of things here concluded: whereupon " myself took occasion, as I was an ear and eye witness, to " set them down and presented them to his Majesty; who " with his own hand mended some things, and eked o- " ther thing, which I had omitted."

Those *Heads*, mention'd in this Letter of Mr. *Galloway*, are next set down at length. All which, as well as this account of the management of the Conference, appear at first sight vastly different from Bishop *Barlow*'s relation. Dr. *John Raynolds* was celebrated for one of the most famous Divines of his age: but if Bishop *Barlow* be credited, and the Doctor talk'd in the Conference, as he relates, he must be look'd upon as the most stupid, silly wretch in the world; so weak and childish is all his discourse. But *Barlow* himself repented, upon his death-bed, of the wrong he had done Dr. *Raynolds* and his Brethren, in the relation he had given of that Conference. This was attested by Dr. *Henry Jackson*. Dr. *Spark*, who was one of the Ministers that appear'd at the Conference, but said not one word in it, and afterward wrote for Conformity, declar'd Dr. *Raynolds* and the other Ministers were wrong'd by that relation: and Dr. *Raynolds* himself made the same complaint. 'Twere too long to set down all that is said upon this head, and therefore I refer the reader to the authors mention'd in the Margin. *

Farther, Dr. *Raynolds* was a Man, who thought more favourably of many points in our controversy than many of his Brethren, and therefore our cause cannot be hurt by what he is represented to have said, if *Barlow*'s account should with any be thought to deserve credit. He was not chosen by our side to manage the Conference, and he and the rest were probably pitch'd upon by the Bishops, and then call'd to it by the King; who might, from the great reputation of the Doctor, be ready to think, the Bishops acted fairly in naming him and the rest upon that occasion: and

* A Review of the *Certamen Epistolare* between *Heylin* and *Hickman*, *p.* 28, 29. *N. C.* vindicated from the Abuses of Mr. *Durel* and *Scrivener*, *p.* 181, *&c.*

and yet no doubt they had their particular views as to every one of them. And I will ingage to run down any cauſe in the world in a conference, let me but have the naming of the parties on both ſides to manage it.

This affair may receive light from what I meet with in an old pamphlet, printed ſoon after the Conference. 'Tis intituled: *A Chriſtian and modeſt offer of a moſt indifferent conference or diſputation, about the maine and principal controverſies betwixt the Prelates, and the late ſilenced and deprived Miniſters in* England: *tendered by ſome of the ſaid Miniſters to the Archbiſhops, and Biſhops, and all their adherents*, 1606. In anſwer to an objection, that theſe matters had meen manag'd in a conference already, 'tis ſaid:

1. "In their objecting to the Miniſters the Conference "at *Hampton Court*, they object to them, as it were, that "which is *non ens*: none of them knowing what it was, "nor any other, ſave a few that were preſent; whoſe re- "ports thereof are ſo diverſe, that one ſpoils the credit of "another. And that which is ſet forth as the true report "of it, being publiſh'd only by the Prelates (who are par- "tial) without the knowledge, advice, or conſent of the "other ſide, deſerves no credit; the rather, conſidering "that Dr. *Morton* hath been allow'd to call ſome part of it "into queſtion, even ſome ſpeeches father'd upon his Ma- "jeſty, which he was faign to confute as unſound and "contrary to Divinity. Wherein ſith the King's own "ſpeeches be, as it ſeemeth, groſly abus'd by the author, "'tis much more likely that ſpeeches of other men are "abus'd. Beſides, none but Prelates, and ſuch as were "partial, being preſent at the firſt days Conference, there "can be no credit at all given to the report thereof: for "'tis more than apparent, that they have fradulently cut "of, and conceal'd all the ſpeeches (which were many) "that his Majeſty utter'd againſt the corruptions of our "Church, and practiſe of our Prelates: as appeareth by "that teſtimony of the Dean of the Chapel, which he "gave thereof, ſaying: *That his Majeſty did that day won- "derfully play the Puritan.* But if he play'd that part no "otherwiſe than is ſpecify'd in the Prelates report, he "acted it very poorly, or rather never a whit. If there- "fore they would have had the Miniſters to ſtand to the "determination of that Conference, they ſhould have "uſed more indifferency and honeſty in the relation of it, "than they have done: they ſhould at leaſt have made it

"appear

" appear by mutual teſtimony of all ſides, that it was a true " act. For they have no reaſon to believe ſuch enemies, " as the Prelates have ſhewed themſelves to be unto them, " any further than they ſee them.

2. " Such a conference as that was never deſir'd by the " Miniſters. And it ſeems by the whole managing of it, " that it was underhand plotted and procur'd by the Pre- " lates themſelves, abuſing therein his Majeſty, and uſing " Mr. *Galloway* as an inſtrument in the matter, to the end " that they might have the more colour for their intended " proceedings afterwards. And there is great probability " of this, for that the Archbiſhop profeſs'd to the Com- " mittees of both Houſes, the laſt Seſſion, that he had " the Letters written from Mr. *Cartwright* to Mr. *Galloway* " about that matter.

3. " Moſt of the perſons, appointed to ſpeak for the " Miniſters, were not of their chuſing, nor nomination, " nor of their judgment in the matters then and now in " queſtion, but of a clean contrary. For being intreated " at that time by the Miniſters to diſpute againſt theſe " things, as things ſimply evil, and ſuch as cannot be yield- " ed to without ſin; they profeſs'd to them, that they " were not ſo perſuaded, and therefore could not ſo do. " Being then requeſted, to let his Majeſty underſtand that " ſome of their Brethren were further perſuaded touch- " ing the unlawfulneſs of theſe things, than themſelves " were; they refus'd that alſo. Laſtly, being intreated " either to give them in writing their reaſons to prove " theſe things indifferent, or to give them an anſwer in " writing to ſuch reaſons, as they would give them in " writing, to prove them ſimply evil; they would do " neither the one, nor the other; ſo that there neither " was, nor could be any hope of good by that Confe- " rence.

4. " The matters in controverſy were not in that Con- " ference thoroughly debated, but nakedly propounded, " and ſome, not all touched: neither was there any one " argument to the purpoſe followed in the ſame.

5. " The Prelates took unto themſelves liberty to in- " terrupt, at their pleaſure, thoſe of the other ſide; inſo- " much that they were check'd for it by his Majeſty.

6. " The Miniſters (if his Majeſty will give them " leave) will at any time, in one weeks ſpace, deliver to " his Majeſty in writing a full anſwer to any argument,

" or

" or assertion, propounded in that Conference against " them by any Prelate: and they do here plainly profess, " that all and every one of them are most vain and fri- " volous. " *

I leave the reader to compare what I have said with our Author's account of that Conference.

One Concession I cannot but take notice of, in which he says, *The King vouchsaf'd to indulge* the Ministers: viz. *That the Sacrament of Baptism should only be celebrated by persons in holy Orders, it being before usual in some places for any Christian man or woman to baptize.*

The Case was thus: K. *James* was very much offended that Laymen, and even women should be allow'd to administer Baptism. Archbishop *Whitgift* and Bishop *Babington*, pretended the Church did not approve of it, but censur'd it. Which certainly was contrary, not only to the *Rubric*, but to fact, as appears by what I have mention'd before. Bishop *Bancroft* therefore warmly oppos'd them both. The matter was thus compromis'd: That the words *lawful Minister* should be added to the *Rubric*, and so the power of administring Baptism should be restrain'd to such. Yet, if we may believe Dr. *Heylyn*, " The al- " teration was greater in sound than sense, it being the " opinion of many great clerks, that any man in cases of " extream necessity (who can pronounce the words of " Baptism) may pass in the account and notion of a law- " ful Minister. " † And to say the truth, he seems not to mistake the mind of the Church in this matter. There is no penalty for Laymen or womens baptizing. And since their Baptism is accounted valid, how can they be esteem'd other than *lawful Ministers?* The Church seems to be concern'd about this one thing only: Whether Baptism be ministred with water in the name of the Father, *&c.* ‖ Whence Bishop *Burnet* says they do not annul such lay Baptisms, or rebaptize persons so baptiz'd, however they condemn the practice. ‡

That the *Hampton Court* Conference did not really go on so smoothly to the Bishops minds, as *Barlow* reports, and that they were discourag'd by the King's behaviour, there seems to me a reasonable suspicion, from what I meet

* P. 28, *&c.* † Laud's *Life*, p. 27. ‖ See the last Rubric for private Bapt. ‡ Exposition of the 39 Art. p. 261.

meet with of Archbiſhop *Whitgift*, who ſeem'd to have conceiv'd ſome dreadful fears of a ſtorm, that would come upon the Church at the ſitting of the Parliament, which was ſoon after: inſomuch that he " deſir'd, not many " days before he was ſtroken, that he might not yet live " to ſee that Parliament, as near as it was." * However he was, as Dr. *Fuller* ſays, therein *more fear'd than hurt.* And Mr. *Cambden* ſays, " that when the King began to " contend about the receiv'd Liturgy, and thought ſome " things ought to be alter'd in it, Archbiſhop *Whitgift* " dy'd with grief. " †

Together with the Parliament the Convocation ſat to do buſineſs, and drew up a long body of Canons, in a plentiful manner dealing out their *Anathema's*, or *ipſo facto Excommunications.*

There was a noble Speech made in this Convocation by the Biſhop of St. *David*'s, Dr. *Anthony Rudd*, *May* 23, 1604. I had it lately ſent me in MS. I doubt not it is in print (tho' I never ſaw it) becauſe I find it quoted by Dr. *Whitby*, in his *Proteſtant Reconciler.* ‖ Whence the Doctor cited it I can't tell, and believe 'tis very rare to be met with; and therefore I preſume it will be no diſpleaſure to my reader, if I preſent him with it, as 'tis in the copy I have by me. The Title is thus: " *The Speeches of the* " *Reverend Father, the Lord Biſhop of St.* David's, *in the* " *Convocation*, May 23, 1604. *before all the Biſhops, and* " *the reſt of the Clergy there aſſembled, grew thus as fol-* " *lows.*

" After that by occaſions of an explication, there exhi- " bited, concerning the Uſe of the ſign of the Croſs in " Baptiſm, with the intent that it might be a ſatisfaction " to ſuch as have been hitherto ſcrupulous in that behalf; " and that the Biſhop of *London*, with ſome other Biſhops, " had ſpoken to preſs the ſame point; at length the Bi- " ſhop of St. *David*'s, grounding his ſpeeches upon the " premiſes immediately beforegoing, ſaid to this effect " following:

" For my part, I acknowledge the antiquity of the uſe " of the Croſs, as mention'd in *Tertullian*, and after him " in *Cyprian*, who reckon'd of *Tertullian* as his Maſter; " inſomuch as when he call'd for his works, he was wont " to

* *Pref.* to Hampton Court Conf. † Annales Jac. ‖ Part I. *Pref. p.* 13.

" to say, *Da Magistrum*; likewise in *Chrysostom*, *Augu-*
" *stine*, and others.

" Also I confess the originals of the ceremonies to have
" sprung by occasion of the Pagans, who reproached the
" ancient Christians, for believing in Christ crucified;
" and that in Popery it hath been superstitiously abused;
" and affirm that it is in the Church of *England* now ad-
" mitted and entertain'd by us, and restor'd to the ancient
" integrity, all superstition abandon'd.

" Likewise I wish, that if the King's Highness shall
" persist in imposing of it, all would submit themselves to
" it (as we do) rather than forego the Ministry in that
" behalf. But I greatly fear by the report which I hear,
" that very many learned Preachers, whose consciences
" are not in our custody, nor to be dispos'd of at our de-
" votion, will not easily be drawn thereunto. Of which
" number, if any shall come in my walk, I desire to be
" furnished beforehand, by those that be present, with
" sufficient reasons to satisfy them (if it be possible) con-
" cerning some points which have been presently deli-
" ver'd.

" First of all, Where there was even now alledg'd for
" the Cross sundry places of scripture; as, *God forbid that*
" *I should rejoice, save in the Cross of Christ*, and divers
" more of the like sense: If any of the adverse opinion
" fall into my company, and say, that those Scripture
" speeches be figurative, implying the death and passion
" of our Saviour Christ, with the effect and fruit there-
" of; and that to draw an argument from them to justify
" the sign of the Cross in the forehead, is an insuffici-
" ent kind of reasoning, and a fallacy; what answer shall
" I make unto them?

" Secondly, Whereas I have observ'd upon present re-
" lation, that the impugners of this ceremony were heard
" at large in the Conference at *Hampton Court*, and ha-
" ving objected the example of *Hezekiah*, who broke in
" pieces the Brazen Serpent, after it had been abused to
" idolatry; and therefore the sign of the Cross (which
" was not brought into the Church by God's express
" commandments, as the Brazen Serpent was, but was
" from the beginning a meer invention of man) ought
" now to be taken away, by reason of the superstitious
" abuse, which is sustain'd in Popery; they receiv'd an-
" swer: That King *Hezekiah* might have preserv'd it,

" aban-

" abandoning the abuſe of it, if it had pleas'd him; and " conſequently it is in the King's Majeſty's power to abo- " liſh this ceremony, having been abuſed, or to retain it " in manner aforeſaid. Hereunto I ſay, that I was one of " the Conference, yet I was not at that part of the Con- " ference, when thoſe that ſtood for Reformation had " acceſs to the King's Majeſty's preſence, and liberty to " ſpeak for themſelves; for that I, and ſome other of my " Brethren the Biſhops were ſecluded from that days aſ- " ſembly: but I ſuppoſe it to be true as it hath been for- " merly reported; and I for my own particular admit the " conſequence put down above. Now becauſe I wiſh all " others abroad to be as well ſatisfied herein, as ourſelves " that be here preſent, if any of the contrary opinion " ſhall come unto me, and ſay, that the foreſaid anſwer " doth not ſatisfy them; becauſe they think it to be a " great reaſon now to move them to become Petitioners " to his Majeſty, for aboliſhing of the Croſs in Baptiſm; " as there was then, to move the godly zealous in *Heze-* " *kiahs* days to be Petitioners for the defacing of the Bra- " zen Serpent; becauſe the Church-going Papiſts, now " living among us, do ſuperſtitiouſly abuſe the one, as " the *Iſraelites* did the other; what ſound anſwer ſhall I " make to them for their better ſatisfaction?

" Thirdly, whereas it hath been this day alledg'd, that " it is convenient and neceſſary to preſerve the memory of " the Croſs of Chriſt, and conſequently by this means; " if haply any of the other ſide ſhall come unto me, and " ſay, that your memory of the Croſs of Chriſt might " be ſufficiently, and more ſafely without danger preſerv'd " by preaching of the doctrine of the Goſpel, the ſum " whereof is Chriſt crucified: in reſpect whereof St. *Paul* " told the *Galatians*, that Jeſus Chriſt was diſcrib'd in " their ſight, and among them, crucified; that it was ſo " lively preached among them, as if his bodily image had " been crucified among them; and yet we know not of " any material or ſignal Croſs that was in uſe in the " Church at that time; I deſire to know, what ſatisfacti- " on or anſwer muſt be given unto them?

" Moreover, I proteſt, that all my ſpeeches now are ut- " ter'd by me by way of propoſition, not by way of op- " poſition; by way of queſtion, and not by way of con- " tradiction, and that they all tend to work pacification " in the Church (if it be poſſible) which I know to be

" very

" very neceſſary at this time: and that I put a great dif-
" ference between *quid liceat*, and *expediat*; and likewiſe
" between them that are ſchiſmatical, or open diſturbers
" of the ſtate eccleſiaſtical eſtabliſhed; and them that are
" ſcrupulous only upon ſome ceremonies, and other cir-
" cumſtances, being otherwiſe learned, ſtudious, grave,
" and honeſt men, whoſe labours have been both painful
" in the Church, and alſo profitable in their ſeveral con-
" gregations.

" Concerning theſe Preachers laſt mention'd, I ſuppoſe
" that if upon the urging them to abſolute ſubſcription,
" and uſe of the ceremonies, and attire preſcrib'd, they
" ſhould ſtand out ſtiff, and chuſe rather to forego their
" livings, and the exerciſe of their Miniſtry; tho I do
" not juſtify their doings therein; yet ſurely their ſervice
" would be miſs'd at ſuch time, as need ſhall require us
" and them to give the right hand of fellowſhip one to
" another, and to go arm in arm againſt the common ad-
" verſary, that ſo might be *vis unita fortior*. In which
" caſe of want of their joint labours with ours, there
" might ariſe cauſe of ſome ſuch doleful complaint; as fell
" out upon an accident of another nature, in the Book of
" *Judges*, where it is ſaid: *For the diviſions of* Reuben
" *were great thoughts of heart.*

" Likewiſe conſider, who muſt be the executioners of
" their deprivation, even we ourſelves the Biſhops; a-
" gainſt whom there will a great clamour of them,
" and their dependents, and many others who are well
" affected towards them; whereby our perſons ſhall be in
" hazard to be brought into great diſlike, if not into ex-
" tream hatred; whereof what inconveniences may en-
" ſue, I leave to your wiſdoms to be conſider'd of.

" Alſo remember, that when the *Benjamites* (though
" for their juſt deſerts in maintaining a bad cauſe) were
" all deſtroy'd, ſaving 800 [*or rather* 600] and the men
" of *Iſrael* ſware in their fury, that none of them would
" give his daughter to the *Benjamites* to wife, that when
" their hot blood was over, they lamented and ſaid: *There*
" *is one tribe cut off from Iſrael this day:* and they uſed all
" their wits, to the uttermoſt of their policy, to reſtore
" that tribe again.

" In like ſort, if theſe our Brethren aforeſaid ſhall be
" depriv'd of their places for the matter premiſed, I think
" we ſhould find cauſe to bend our wits to the uttermoſt

" extent of our skill, to provide some cure of souls for " them, where they may exercise their talents.

" Furthermore, if these men, being divers hundreds " (as it is bruited abroad) should forsake their charges (as " some do presuppose they will) who, I pray you, should " succeed them? Verily I know not where to find so " many able Preachers in this realm unprovided for. But " be it, that so many may be found to supply their empty " rooms, yet they might more conveniently be settled in " the seats of unpreaching Ministers; and so the number " of Preachers should be much encreased. But if they " shall be put in the places of these men, being dispos- " sess'd, thereupon would follow: First, That the num- " ber of preaching Incumbents should not be multiply'd " by this supply. And secondly, The Church could not " in likelihood be so well and fitly furnish'd on a sudden; " for that though haply the new supply should be of men " as learned as the former; yet it is not probable, that " they should be at their first coming from the Universi- " ty, or in a good while after, so ready Preachers, so ex- " perienced in pastoral government, so well acquainted " with the manners and usage of the people, and so dis- " creet every way in their carriage of themselves, as the " other, who have spent already many years abroad in " their ministerial charge.

" Beside this, forasmuch as in the time of the late Arch- " bishop of *Canterbury*, these things were not so extream- " ly urged, but that many learned Preachers injoy'd their " liberty herein, conditionally, that they did not by word " or deed openly disgrace or disturb the estate established; " I would know a reason why it should now be so gene- " rally, and exceeding straitly called upon; especially see- " ing that those means are now more necessary, by so " much as we see greater increase of Papists to be now of " late, than was before?

" To conclude, I wish, that if by Petition made to the " King's Majesty, there cannot be obtain'd a quite " remove of the premises, which seem too grievous to " divers, nor yet a toleration for them which be of the " more staied and temperate carriage; yet at the least " there might be procur'd a mitigation of the penalty, if " they cannot be drawn by our reasons to a conformity " with us.

" After

" After this the Bishop of *London*, with three other " Bishops, *viz. Winchester*, *Ely*, and *Lincolne*, made answer " to that the Bishop of St. *Davids* had spoken: but he " was forbid by the President of the assembly to make a- " ny reply; and he submitted himself obediently thereun- " to, affirming, that because nothing was more dear un- " to him, than the peace of the Church, therefore he " will still pursue the course which he had always held, " in using the best means and persuasions he could, to " draw all others to unity and conformity with himself, " and the rest of the reverend company. And so that " Conference ended as it began in quiet."

I beg leave to make a few remarks briefly upon this Paper.

1. 'Tis very probable from this Speech, that Bishop *Barlow*'s representation of the Conference at *Hampton Court* is not a true one; and indeed that the Bishops design'd not to let the Ministers have fair treatment at the Conference, or the world have a just account of it afterwards. Why else should they take such care to exclude this honest Bishop *Rudd*, and some others (I suppose of the same temper) from the debates?

2. Those men could have little regard to honour, or justice, or to the edification of the Church, who, when they were thus honestly warn'd, would yet contrive needlessly such a wicked engine to rack the consciences of learned Ministers, who had deserv'd well of the Church by their labours; or else deprive the Church of them, at a time when they had not others to supply their places.

3. It was a sign they had very little reason for what they did, when they could satisfy themselves to alledge Scriptures so little to their purpose, as that: *God forbid that I should glory, save in the Cross of Christ.*

4. Whereas Dr. *Nichols* pretends the Church of *England* has imitated *Hezekiah*, in laying aside all usages that have any appearance of superstition, and that his example makes for their praise; * 'tis evident, the advocates for the Cross in the Synod were sensible of the contrary, and therefore pleaded that the breaking of the Brazen Serpent was an indifferent thing, and *Hezekiah* might as well have preserv'd it.

* p. 166.

5. Convocations are not much to be regarded, since there appears to be so little liberty for free debating of matters in them. When such a noble Speech as this, made by a Reverend Bishop, was answer'd by four Bishops, he is forbid by the President to say any thing in defence of it. The discovering and establishing the truth is not to be hoped for from such partial proceedings.

6. What wonder that such men will not hearken to reasons offer'd by us; when they so little regard good sense, when it comes from one of their own Bishops?

MDCIV. And now the Persecution was renew'd with great fury. " In the second year, *says* Mr. *Cal-*
" *derwood*, after the King's coming into *England*,
" three hundred Ministers were either silenced, or de-
" priv'd of their Benefices, or excommunicated, or cast
" into prison, or forc'd to leave their own country; the
" relicks of Popery, which were much grown out of use
" before Queen *Elizabeth*'s death, were now restor'd. A
" more grievous persecution of the orthodox faith is not
" to be met with in history, in any prince's reign.

" The next year it began to rage in *Scotland*, and con-
" tinues to this very time (1623) to do so. The Bi-
" shops, by virtue of the High Commission, or a juris-
" diction delegated to them from the King, have possess'd
" themselves of all ordinary jurisdiction, wherein they
" strengthen themselves, and turn out the best Ministers
" and quite alter and overthrow the excellent polity,
" which was establish'd in the Church, which the King
" himself and they also were sworn to maintain: and
" giving the name of *Puritans* to orthodox and pious
" Ministers, they wound the purity of religion, and
" God's worship thro' their side. This was the Jesuite
" *Dolman*'s advice, that the Puritans were to be kept
" under, while the *Roman* Catholics should grow in
" numbers and strength, so as not only to be equal, but
" superior to their enemies." *

Our Bishops could not be content with their Hierarchy at home; but, having the advantage of King *James*'s being with them, they resolv'd to have it obtruded upon their neighbours: and being nice Casuists in the business of oaths, could help the King well enough over that

* Alt. Dam. *in Prof.*

that he had taken in *Scotland*, if he chanced to boggle at it.

The conduct of that Prince is really very strange. In a General Assembly, at *Edinburg*, 1590, " He praised " God, that he was born in such a time, as in the time " of the light of the Gospel; to such a place, as to be " King of such a Kirk, the sincerest Kirk of the world. " The Kirk of *Geneva*, said he, keeped *Pasch* and *Yule*, " [*Easter* and *Christmass*] What have they for them? " They have no institution. As for our neighbour Kirk " *England*, their service is an evil said Mass in *English*; " they want nothing of the Mass, but the liftings. I " charge you, my good people, Ministers, Doctors, El- " ders, Nobles, Gentlemen and Barons, to stand to your " purity, and to exhort the people to do the same; and " I forsooth, so long as I brook my life and crown, shall " maintain the same. " *

And in another Speech in 1598, he declar'd: " He " minded not to bring in Papistical, or *Anglican* Bish- " ops. " †

Nay, and after he was proclaim'd King of *England*, " in his harangue in the Kirk of *Edinburg*, he thanked " God, that he had settled both Kirk and kingdom, and " left them in that state, which he intended not to hurt, " or alter any ways, his subjects living in peace. " ‖

And yet soon after he came into *England*, he shew'd himself very bitter, not only against the *English* Puritans, but against the *Scots* Ministers also. Nay, and in his first Speech to both Houses of Parliament, " He acknowledg'd " the Church of *Rome* to be our mother Church, altho' " defil'd with some corruptions. He said, he would be " content for his own part, to meet those of the Roman " Kirk in the midway, so that all novelties might be re- " nounc'd on either side. " ‡ What pity was it that such things should drop from a King, who had express'd so very different a sense of religious matters before! It had been well for this nation, if he had had no such views at the time when he sought the *Spanish* match for his Son, which, tho' it miscarry'd, was the unhappy copy that was follow'd in the *French* that took effect.

I cannot here but remark these two things:

* Cald. Hist. *p.* 286. † *p* 418. ‖ *p.* 473. ‡ Cald. Hist. *p.* 478.

1. That our Adverſaries are moſt reſtleſs in their endeavours to obtrude their Hierarchy and ceremonies. They are never ſatisfied, while they cannot by force or fraud engage others to reſtore thoſe remnants of Popery, which they have retain'd themſelves.

Thus they got firſt their Prelacy, and afterwards their ceremonies eſtabliſh'd in the Church of *Scotland*. And it very much concerns our Brethren abroad, who are appeal'd to in our controverſy, to take particular notice of this matter. Now indeed, Brethren, our Adverſaries flatter you, that you may give judgment in their favour: and yet, if you ſhould do it (which God forbid!) they will never much eſteem you, till you embrace all their fancies, and endeavour to eſtabliſh them in your Churches. Believe me, they will otherwiſe ſoon return to their wonted diſlike of you. Even our Brethren at *Geneva* muſt, upon any other condition, quickly loſe their eſteem; they are upon their good behaviour, whether they ſhall be call'd the *Church*, or the *Rout* of *Geneva*.

Whoever conſiders the temper of our Adverſaries, will not wonder, that, when they had got King *James*, apt enough to hearken to their advice, they ſhould be ſo officious in meddling with the affairs of *Scotland*, and ſowing the ſeeds of diſcord and confuſion among them. Thus Dr. *Bancroft*, who was afterward Archbiſhop of *Canterbury*, play'd the buſybody in the *Scots* affairs in Queen *Elizabeth*'s time; and in 1589, brib'd one *Norton* an *Engliſh* Bookſeller, living in *Edinburgh*, to betray the *Scots* affairs to him, as he confeſs'd with tears upon his examination. The many curious articles he employ'd him to ſearch into are ſet down by *Calderwood*. * And in *January* 1591, were intercepted his Letters to Mr. *Patrick Adamſon*, wherein "he advis'd him to give the Queen of *England* "more honourable ſtiles, and to praiſe the Church of "*England* above all other. He ſaid, he marvell'd why he "came not to *England*, as he was look'd for; and aſſur'd "him, that he would be very well accepted by my Lord "of *Canterbury*'s Grace, and well rewarded, if he came." This *Adamſon* was excommunicated, and repenting him of what he had done againſt the Church, earneſtly ſought abſolution. Part of the confeſſion he made ran thus: "I "grant

* Hiſt. *p.* 245. *p.* 252.

" grant I was more busy with some Bishops in *England*, " in prejudice of the discipline of our Kirk, partly when " I was there, and partly by mutual intelligence since, " than became a good Christian, much less a faithful Pa- " stor. Neither is there any thing that more ashameth " me, than my often deceiving and abusing the Kirk here- " tofore, by confessions, subscriptions, protestations, *&c.*"

Dr. *Heylyn* likewise tells us, that when he became Bishop of *London*, " and knew how much the peace of this " Church did depend upon it, he manag'd a secret cor- " respondency with King *James* in *Scotland*, insinuating " to him the necessity of conforming the Churches of " both kingdoms in government and forms of worship, " and laying down a plot for restoring Episcopacy to " that Church without noise or trouble." *

2. I would here observe that our Adversaries, how- ever rigid they were in their notions in King *James*'s time, have since grown worse. To which purpose I shall tran- scribe a passage from Mr. *Hickman*: " Some, that had " been ordain'd by meer Presbyters, offer'd themselves in " King *James*'s time to be consecrated Bishops, in the " Church of *Scotland*. Dr. *Andrews* Bishop of *Ely* moved " this question: Whether they should not first be Episco- " pally ordain'd Presbyters, that they might be capable of " being admitted into the order of Bishops? But Arch- " bishop *Bancroft*, a most rigid asserter of Episcopacy, " answer'd: There was no need of it, since ordination by " Presbyters was valid. The Bishop of *Ely* yielded, and " immediately, without repeating their ordination as " Presbyters, they were consecrated Bishops. But they " who lately [after the Restauration of King *Charles*] con- " secrated Mr. *James Sharp*, proceeded in a very different " manner. For as though he had been a meer Layman " before, they first ordain him a Deacon, then a Priest, " and then a Bishop." † The same author mentions another instance of moderation a little later than that of *Bancroft*: " When the Archbishop of *Spalato* was in *Eng-* " *land*, he desir'd Bishop *Morton* to reordain a person or- " dain'd beyond sea, that he might be the more capable of " preferment. The Bishop wrote him in answer: That " it could not be done but to the scandal of the Reform'd

* Life of Laud, *p.* 63. *Compare his* Hist. Presb. *p.* 355. † Apol. *p.* 38.

" Churches, wherein he would have no hand. " For the truth of the former of these stories he appeals to *Spotswood*'s History; and for proof of the latter to Mr. *Calendrin*, the *Dutch* Minister, who had the original of the Bishop's Letter in his possession.

If any one desires to know what sort of men those Bishops were, whom King *James* settled in *Scotland*, Mr. *Calderwood* will soon inform him, that some of them were of very bad morals, and others grievously repented their accepting Bishopricks. I shall give an Instance of each sort.

" Mr. *George Gladstones*, after he had sworn that he " should never be Bishop of St. *Andrews*, because the " Bishops of that See made a miserable end, and were " much hated; yet return'd from Court, in the beginning " of *January* with presentation to that Bishoprick. Up- " on the tenth of *January*, he declar'd in the presence " of the Presbytery of St. *Andrews*, that as he departed " a Brother, so he return'd, and would usurp no superio- " rity over them, but content himself with a simple vote " as the rest; and promis'd to behave himself as humbly, " yea more humbly, than ever before: yet when some " gentlemen, his favourites, and others who had hope of " advancement by him, asked, how he could bear with " the Presbytery: he answer'd: *Hold your tongue, we* " *shall steal them off their feet*, " *

Mr. *James Nicholson*, another of them, died with grief, when he saw his devices cross'd, neither the King nor the Church contented, and his own estimation much impair'd. " Before his departure he utter'd these, or the like words: " *The digesting of the Bishoprick hath wracked my stomach.* " He would not suffer the stile of Bishop to be put in his " latter will. Mr. *David Lendsey*, then Minister at *Dun-* " *dee*, his familiar friend, set down his last speeches in " *Latin* verse; and among the rest his exhortation to him- " self, not to haunt the Court, and to eschew all im- " ployments. But this exhortation wrought no good " upon himself: for he made no scruple to accept the " Bishoprick of *Brechen* some few years after. " †

The

* *p.* 487. † *p.* 570.

The Verſes, wherein he deſcribes the Biſhop's trouble, about his having accepted the Biſhoprick, are ſet down in a Treatiſe at the end of the *Altare Damaſcenum*; * which a friend of mine has thus rendred:

In vain my wife and friends wou'd give relief,
In vain they try to eaſe my raging grief:
The learn'd Phyſicians art's apply'd in vain,
No drugs, alaſs! can reach my inward pain.
Thou only, Royal James, *can'ſt comfort give,*
Without thy help I can no longer live:
Remove this Mitre from my burthen'd head,
Or ſoon I am numbred with th' unhappy dead.
This burden ſinks (do thou theſe fears diſpel)
My body to the grave, my ſoul to hell.

But let us leave *Scotland* for a while, and come nearer home. The Biſhops, having gain'd the eaſy King to their ſide, fell heavily upon their Brethren. A little Treatiſe was printed in the year 1605, call'd: *A ſhort Dialogue, proving that the ceremonies, and ſome other corruptions now in queſtion, are defended by none other arguments, than ſuch as the Papiſts have heretofore uſed, and our Proteſtant writers have long ſince anſwer'd.* And in that the method taken by the Biſhops is thus related: "At firſt ſubſcription was "hotly urg'd, and that not by other Biſhops only, but "even by the now Archbiſhop of *Canterbury*, at ſuch "time, as conventing all the Miniſters of *London* before "him, he took his leave, being to go to the See of *Can-*"*terbury*. But when it was diſcern'd, that a far greater "number would refuſe than was ſuppos'd, and than his "Majeſty and the Lords perhaps were born in hand "would; this ſecond courſe was taken, that men ſhould "be preſſed (for the time) but to Conformity; and it be-"ing diſcern'd that the number of refuſers would ſtill be "great, they have ſince fallen yet lower, accepting of ſome "the uſe of the Croſs and Surplice only; of others the uſe "of the Surplice alone; of others a promiſe to uſe them "only; and of ſome the profeſſion of their judgment only "that they may be uſed, without preſſing them to the uſe "of them at all. Their purpoſe, *he ſays*, herein was to "draw

* *p.* 57.

" draw men on, by ſteps and degrees to ſubſcription. " And then he ſets down at length a Letter of Archbiſhop *Bancroft* to the Biſhops about this matter. 'Twas dated *December* 18. 1604. Therein he advertiſes them of ſuch a courſe and uniform kind of proceeding with the diſobedient and obſtinate Miniſters, as he thought fit ſhould be uſed by himſelf and his Brethren: *viz.* As to ſuch Miniſters as were not already placed in the Church, the 36 and 37 Canons were to be obſerv'd, and none were to be admitted to execute any eccleſiaſtical function without ſubſcription. Such as were already placed in the Church, were of two ſorts:

1. Some offer and promiſe Conformity, but are unwilling again to ſubſcribe. Of them he ſays: For as much as the near affinity betwixt Conformity and ſubſcription doth give apparent hope, that, *being men of ſincerity*, they will in ſhort time frame themſelves to a more conſtant courſe, and ſubſcribe to that again, which they, by their practice, teſtify not to be repugnant to the word of God; your Lordſhip may (an act being made to remain on record of ſuch their offer and promiſe) *reſpite their ſubſcription for ſome ſhort time.*

2. Others in their obſtinacy will yield to neither ſubſcription, nor promiſe of Conformity. Theſe are either ſtipendary Curates, or ſtipendary Lecturers, or men beneficed. The two firſt he orders to be ſilenc'd; the third to be depriv'd. He ſays, the King's Proclamation, 16, *July*, 1604, admoniſh'd them to conform themſelves to the Church, and obey the ſame, or elſe to diſpoſe of themſelves and their families ſome other ways, as being men unfit, for their obſtinacy and contempt, to occupy ſuch places: and beſides, they are within the compaſs of ſeveral laws.

MDCVII. Mr. *Robert Parker*, a Puritan Miniſter, this year publiſh'd a very learned *Treatiſe of the Croſs in Baptiſm.* It muſt be own'd his fancy was ſomewhat odd, as to his manner of handling his argument, but all muſt allow that his Book had a great deal of learning in it; and our Adverſaries would have done their cauſe no harm, if they had ſhew'd themſelves able to anſwer it. But they knew what was the moſt effectual way of ſilencing their adverſaries, and therefore exaſperating the King againſt him, they got him to put forth a Proclamation, with an offer of a reward, for the taking

taking him. He therefore resolving to take the first opportunity of leaving the kingdom, lay hid sometime a little way out of *London*, where a treacherous servant in the family endeavour'd to betray him, and brought officers to the house to search for him. He was then actually in the house, and yet preserv'd by the special providence of God. The only room in the house they neglected to search was that where he was, from whence he heard them quarrelling, and swearing at one another; one saying, they had not search'd that room, and another confidently asserting the contrary, and refusing to suffer it to be search'd over again. This story the author of the Epistle, prefix'd to his *Ecclesiastical Polity*, had in his eye in those words, *Huic autem incumbentem*, &c. "When "*Parker* was thus writing, which was fatigue enough it "self, such a dreadful storm fell upon him from the "Church, upon the account of his *Treatise of the Cross*, "that unless he had sav'd himself by flight, *(wherein he "was favour'd by the special providence of God)* he had "been cast into prison, where, without doubt, he must "have remain'd 'till the day of his death." Mr. *Parker* got into *Holland*, and had been chosen Minister of the *English* Church at *Amsterdam*, had it not been that the magistrates were afraid of disobliging King *James*. For the Burgomasters of the City sent them word: "That "they desir'd to keep friendship with his Majesty of *Great* "*Britain*, and therefore they should surcease from the "pursuit of that business." * Afterward he went to *Doesburgh*, and was Minister to the garison; and there he died. †

While the *Scots* new-made Bishops grew warm in their preferments, the Presbyterian Ministers of that kingdom were driven from their flocks, and some of them sent for up to Court by the King, and detain'd there whether they would or not.

Thus the two *Melvins*, among others, were a long time kept from their country and their cures. They were commanded to be present at the King's Chapel on the Feast of St. *Michael*. This was done without all question to vex those good men, who could not but be sorely displeased at what

* Paget against Best and Davenport, *p.* 27. † *Pref. to* Paget's Def. of Ch. Government.

what they there saw; *viz.* the vain pomp of the Church and the Altar, and the King and Queen making their offerings at the Altar. A *German* happening to be present at the same time, cried out with indignation: *I never beheld such a worship as this! Nothing is here wanting to make it a solemn Mass, except it be the adoration of the Host.* Mr. *Andrew Melvin* describ'd, and severely expos'd the furniture of the Altar upon that occasion, in an ingenious Epigram:

The royal Altar stands (portentous sight!)
Adorn'd with two clos'd books, and tapers without light.
Two flaggons of refulgent metal shine,
Glorious without, but empty all within.
Do's England *then God's heavenly truth conceal?*
Or do's he not to her his heavenly truth reveal?
Is her religion thus obscure and gross?
Blind in her light, and purify'd to dross?
For while these Romish *features we can trace,*
We see the scarlet Whore's new-painted face.

Mr. *Andrew Melvin* was laid up in the Tower for these Verses, and his Brethren, without any pretence of law, were not used much better. For though there was no accusation laid against them of any thing done by them in *England*, which was the only thing for which they could be proceeded against here; yet the King, thro' the instigation of Archbishop *Bancroft* and his Brethren, would not suffer them to return home, but committed them as guests to the keeping of the Bishops and other principal Clergymen, that they might have an opportunity to instruct and manage them. The Ministers desir'd, "They might rather "attend his Majesty's leisure upon their own cost and "charges, as they had done some months already, than to "trouble such, to whom neither could they be pleasant "guests, nor they pleasant hosts to them. They said, "they had houses and tables of their own, according to "the fashion of their country, and condition of their "callings, more accustom'd to give meat, than to take of "any. Some of them were aged and diseased, and there-"fore 'twas not fit that men of such honour and worship "[as the Bishops] should be troubled with them. And "likewise that 'twas manifest, where opinions differ, there "cannot be found agreement in affection. Truly, said "*Ban-*

" *Bancroft* in anſwer, ye ſpeak true, and like honeſt men " as ye are. And I think, my Brethren the Biſhops would " have little pleaſure of you, except it were to pleaſure the " King's Majeſty. For our cuſtom is, after our ſerious " matters, to refreſh ourſelves an hour or two with Cards, " or other game, after our meal. But ye are more pre- " ciſe."*

I have the rather mention'd this, that the reader may ſee what ſort of men our chief Adverſaries have been; ſtiff defenders and maintainers of thoſe Canons, which being made againſt the Diſſenters, have no relation to piety and good manners; while they neglect thoſe Canons, which they have made themſelves, for the good converſation of Miniſters.

This very Biſhop was Preſident of the Synod 1603, in which thoſe bitter Canons were fram'd againſt Diſſenters. In that collection there was one Canon bearing this Title: *Sober converſation requir'd in Miniſters*, And now within three or four years after the making them, the very Preſident of the Synod is not aſham'd to own himſelf a notorious breaker of them. I ſhall tranſcribe the whole Canon, it being really a good one, and there being hardly another in the pack worth any thing. " No eccleſiaſti- " cal perſon ſhall at any time, other than for their honeſt " neceſſities, reſort to any Tavern or Alehouſes, neither " ſhall they board or lodge in any ſuch places. Further- " more they ſhall not give themſelves to any baſe or " ſervile labour, or to drinking, or riot, ſpending their " time idlely by day or by night, playing at Dice, Cards or " Tables, or any other unlawful game: but at all times " convenient, they ſhall hear or read ſomewhat of the " Holy Scriptures, or ſhall occupy themſelves with ſome " other honeſt ſtudy or exerciſe; always doing the things " which ſhall appertain to honeſty, and endeavouring to " profit the Church of God, having always in mind " that they ought to excel others in purity of life, and " ſhould be examples to the people to live well and Chriſt- " ianly; under pain of eccleſiaſtical cenſures, to be inflicted " with ſeverity, according to the qualities of their offen- " ces.†" But, alas! there was none to call this Arch-Biſhop to an account; and if we may judge of the Canons by

* Cald Hiſt. *p.* 563. † Can 75.

by the practice of the Church, they were never design'd againſt gaming, drinking Miniſters, but againſt ſuch as would be hardy enough to diſpute their power and authority.

I can't but here take notice of the cruel and perſecuting ſpirit of this Archpiſhop, in an inſtance that happen'd about the year 1610. " *Thomas Lad*, a Merchant of *Yarmouth* " in *Norfolk*, was brought before the Chancellor of *Nor-* " *wich*, for a ſuppoſed Conventicle; becauſe that he, on " the Sabbath days, after the ſermons ended, ſojourning in " the houſe of Mr. *Jackler* in *Yarmouth*, who was late " Preacher of *Yarmouth*, join'd with him in repeating the " ſubſtance and heads of the ſermons that day made in " the Church, at which *Thomas Lad* was uſually pre- " ſent; and was forced upon his oath to anſwer certain " articles touching that meeting, which he could not ſee " until he was ſworn. And having anſwer'd upon his " oath twice before the Chancellor there, he was brought " to *Lambeth* before the Eccleſiaſtical Commiſſioners, to " make a farther anſwer upon a new oath, touching the " ſuppos'd Conventicle; which he refus'd to do, with- " out ſight of his former anſwers (becauſe he was charg'd " with perjury) and therefore was impriſon'd by the Com- " miſſioners a long time, and could not be bail'd.

" *Richard Maunſel*, another priſoner, being a Preach- " er, was charg'd to have been partaker in a Petition ex- " hibited to the nether Houſe of Parliament; and for re- " fuſing to take the oath *ex officio*, to anſwer to certain " articles which he could not be permitted to ſee; he was " impriſon'd by the Commiſſioners at *Lambeth*, where he " remain'd very long, and could not be bail'd. Both theſe " where brought to the bar upon the Writ of *Habeas cor-* " *pus*;"* and Mr. *Nicolas Fuller* their Lawyer, and a very learned man in his profeſſion, pleaded earneſtly their cauſe. His argument is in print, and from thence I have tranſcrib'd their caſe. This does not uſe to be reckon'd any offence in a lawyer in our country: but the Archbiſhop pretending he had got an advantage againſt him, caſt him into priſon, and implacable as he was, there he detain'd him a cloſe priſoner till he died.

A

* Fuller's Argument, *p.* 1. 2.

A mighty ſtir there was at this time about building *Chelſey College*. It was pretended to be deſign'd for Divines, who ſhould ſtudy and write in maintenance of all controverſies againſt the Papiſts. * But King *James* ſeems to have had a very different view, if we may believe Father *Paul*, who had more inſight into the intrigues of the ſeveral Courts of *Chriſtendom*, than any man of his time. For he thus ſpeaks of that College. "It was thought that they that govern there, had "a deſign to make it a controverſial foundation, to pacify "diſcords; but the deputing of two *Jeſuits* to read con- "troverſies, do's not look any thing like ſuch a thing." † MDCIX.

The perſecuting of the Diſſenters, as may be eaſily imagin'd, went on furiouſly in this reign. The King's fancy was wonderfully pleas'd with the applauſes and flatteries of the Biſhops; and he was not backward to gratify them with indulging them a liberty to vex and oppreſs their Brethren. In the year 1618, he publiſh'd a Declaration giving liberty for all manner of ſports on the Lord's Day to ſuch as had been at Church at evening prayers, and forbidding all others to uſe that liberty. Licentiouſneſs of morals was then thought the moſt ready way to promote a zeal for the Hierarchy and ceremonies. This courſe was afterwards purſued afreſh in the reign of his Son. And it was not now firſt begun; but, as *Camden* tells us, the King had given this liberty before to thoſe of *Lancaſhire*; ‖ that is, as a writer of thoſe times, and living thereabouts, ſays, in the year 1617. For in that year, according to him, "Dr. *Morton*, Biſhop of *Cheſter*, fram'd the directions for "the firſt liberty granted to ſports on the Lord's Day; "at the ſame time he ſo eagerly proſecuted the Noncon- "formiſts for ceremonies." ‡

Mr. *David Caldewood*, being forc'd to leave his country for the ſake of his religion, publiſh'd his *Altare Damaſcenum* under the feigned name of *Edward Didoclavius*. The King was very ſenſible of the ſtrength and learning of that Treatiſe, however diſpleas'd he was with it. For "being after the reading of it "ſomewhat penſive, and being ask'd the reaſon by an *Eng-* "*liſh* Prelate, ſtanding by and obſerving it; he told him "he MDCXXIII.

* *See* Fuller's Ch. Hiſt. *B.* 10. *p.* 51. † Letters of Father Paul, *p.* 399.
‖ Annals Jac. An. 1618. ‡ *See the Preface to* Paget's Def. of Ch. Government.

" he had seen, and read such a Book: wherupon the " Prelate, willing his Majesty not to let that trouble him, " for they would answer it; he reply'd, not without " some Passion: *What — will you answer, man? There* " *is nothing here, than Scripture, reason, and Fathers.*" * Nor was his Majesty out in his judgment, for the patrons of Episcopacy have never yet answer'd it, how much soever their cause requires it. But when a soild answer was despair'd of, another way of handling him was attempted, which take in Mr. *Calderwood*'s own words: " *Patrick* " *Scot*, a landed Gentleman beside *Falkland*, having wa- " sted his patrimony, had no other meane to recover his " estate, but by some unlawful shift at Court. He set " forth a recantation under the name of a banish'd Mini- " ster, Mr. *David Calderwood*, who, becaus of his long " sickness before, was suppos'd by many to have been " dead. The King, as he alledg'd himself to some of his " friends, furnish'd him with the matter, and he set the " matter down in form. This course failing, he went " over to *Holland*, and sought the said Mr. *David* in sun- " dry towns, especially in *Amsterdam*, in the month of " *November*. It appeareth, his purpose was to dispatch " the said Mr. *David*. After he had staid at *Amsterdam* " twenty days, and made diligent inquiry, he was inform'd " the said Mr. *David* was return'd home privately to his " own country."†

King *James* seems at last to have met with his MDCXXV. match, and to have had a foul trick play'd him in helping him out of the world, which made way for his Son *Charles* to succeed him. And under his government the tyranny and persecution of the Bishops came to its height. But let us here follow our Author, who says:

In his reign what dismal tragedies were excited by the Puritans, future ages will both feel and lament.‖ 'Tis an easy matter for men to lay the blame upon their adversaries of what they have done themselves. 'Tis to the immortal honour of the Puritans, that they fell in with that noble Parliament of Patriots, that stood up against tyranny in Church and state, without which our nation must have been utterly ruin'd. And those *tragedies* our Author men-

* *Pref. to his* Hist. † *p.* 802 ‖ *p.* 23

mentions, are to be intirely aſcrib'd to the High Churchmen, who have been always the cauſe of whatever calamity has come upon us.

In the beginning of his reign one Leighton, *a fierce Scotch Puritan, publiſh'd a wicked Book call'd* Zion's Plea, *which he had the confidence to preſent to the Parliament, then ſitting, wherein he excites the Parliament and people to kill all the Biſhops; in the ſame Pamphlet bitterly inveighing againſt the Queen, calling her a daughter of* Heth, *a* Canaanite *and idolatreſs. For writing which Book he was by Sentence of the* Star Chamber *order to be publicly whipt, and have his ears cropt.*

Suppoſing what is here ſaid were the whole truth of the matter, and that *Leighton* had wrote with an intemperate heat and fury on our ſide, is the whole party of the Puritans to bear the blame of it? If ſo, what muſt become of our Author's party, which has abounded with ſuch kind of writers in every reign? *Leighton* can't compare with his *Sacheverels*, *Mathers*, *Tillies*, and abundance more who might be named, if there was occaſion for it. Beſides, what compariſon can there be between words and deeds? If *Leighton excited the Parliament and people to kill all the Biſhops*; ſurely this is a leſs crime, than the Biſhops actually killing a greater number of the Puritans. And if *oppreſſion makes a wiſe man mad*, * what wonder if the intolerable oppreſſion of the Biſhops hurried ſome of the Puritans into methods that were inconvenient? But the aſſertion of our Author is falſe, that he *excited the Parliament and people to kill all the Biſhops*. The truth is this: Reckoning up a great many grievances and miſeries, which were owing to the Hierarchy, he excited the Parliament utterly to root out the Hierarchy, that ſo the nation might be freed from all farther danger from it: but that he any where urg'd, that all the Biſhops, for the ſake of their office, ſhould be put to death, whether they had been guilty of any crime or no, is what I can't find in his Book. Nay, I meet with that which is directly contrary. Thus he ſpeaks toward the concluſion of his Book: "To make an end of our preſent ſubject: We wiſh your "Honours might prevail with the Prelates by fair means "to caſt off that overcharging calling. —— If they will

* Eccl. vii. 7.

" not be thus perſuaded——we fear they are alike pleu-
" ritic patients, that cannot ſpit, whom nothing but in-
" ciſion will cure: we mean of *their callings*, not of *their*
" *perſons*; to whom we have no quarrel, but wiſh them
" better than they either wiſh to us, or to themſelves.
" One of their deſperate Mountebanks out of the Pulpit
" could find no cure for us, their ſuppos'd enemies, but
" pricking in the bladder: but we *have not ſo learned*
" *Chriſt.*" * What little credit is to be given to men, who repreſent the ſenſe of authors directly contrary to their own moſt expreſs words?

The other paſſage our Author refers to, is this: " A
" fourth thing that we much importun'd God for, was
" the breaking the *Spaniſh* match, and our Prince's ſafe
" return from *Spain*. God in mercy granted both, but
" we were ſo unthankful for both theſe in a right manner,
" and brake up our watching over him for a better help-
" er; that God ſuffer'd him, to our heavy wo, to *match*
" *with the Daughter of* Heth, *tho' he miſt an* Egyptian." †
There might be perhaps ſome indecency in his ſpeaking thus of the Queen, while alive; but the meaning of his expreſſion is obvious, that ſhe was a Papiſt; and ſo ſhe was, and a bitter one too. And the author may well be excus'd, now the whole nation is ſatisfy'd his Popiſh match was very pernicious to the kingdom. " Had it not been,
" *ſays* Archbiſhop *Tillotſon*, for the countenance which
" Popery had by the marriages and alliances of our Princes,
" for two or three generations together, with thoſe of
" that religion, it had not probably had a continuance a-
" mong us to this day." ‖ And afterwards he adds:
" Let us now at length reſolve never to join in affinity
" with the people of theſe abominations; ſince our alli-
" ances with them, by marriage, have had ſo fatal an in-
" fluence, both upon the public peace and tranquility of
" the nation, and upon the welfare alſo of private fami-
" lies. And in my mind, *the people of theſe abominations* is not a much better expreſſion, than *the Daughters of Heth*; and had it been uſed at the ſame time *Leighton*'s was, would have been equally reſented. By both is meant perſons of a foreign and idolatrous religion. Whether he calls her a *Canaanite* I can't tell; if he do's, it has no other

* *p.* 343. † *p.* 172. ‖ Serm. V. 3. *p.* 67.

other meaning, than that she was an *idolatress*; which was matter of fact, for all Papists are such. But if we may judge by the words laid in the indictment, we shall find his troubles were not procur'd by what he said against the Queen. I shall transcribe an account of his case from a Letter of Mr. *Ludlow* to Dr. *Hollingworth*.

" Upon the 17 of *February* 1629, Dr. *Leighton*, coming " out of *Blackfriars Church*, was seiz'd by a warrant from " the High Commission Court, and drag'd to Bishop " *Laud*'s house. From thence, without any examination, " he was carried to *Newgate*, and there clap'd into irons, " and thrust into a nasty hole, where he continued from " *Tuesday night* till *Thursday noon* without meat or drink. " They kept him in that loathsom place, where snow and " rain beat in upon him, fifteen weeks, not permitting his " wife, or any friend to come near him, and deny'd to " give him a copy of his commitment. Then they brought " him into the *Star Chamber* Court, where an information " was exhibited against him, for publishing a Book, call'd: " *Sion's Plea against the Prelates*. By his answer he con- " fess'd, that when the Parliament was sitting in the year " 1628, he drew up the heads of that Book, and having " the approbation of five hundred persons under their " hands, whereof some were Members of Parliament, he " went into *Holland* to get it printed: that he printed " but between five or six hundred, only for the use of the " Parliament; but they being dissolv'd, he return'd home, " not bringing any of them into the land, but made it " his special care to suppress them." *

" The Doctor being charg'd by the information with " these words in the said Book: *We do not read of greater* " *persecution of God's people, than in this our Island, espe-* " *cially since the death of Queen* Elizabeth: he confess'd " the words, and answer'd: That the thing was too " true, by the Prelates taking away life and livelihood " from many Ministers and private men, of whom many " were pined to death in prison, and many wander'd up " and down, their families being left desolate and help- " less: that besides this, the blood of souls had been en- " danger'd by the removal of the faithful shepherds from " the flock. This was a cutting truth, and *Laud* being

* p. [illegible]

" enrag'd, desir'd the Court to put the highest censure " that could be put upon him. That they did to his con- " tent, condemning him [after deprivation] to have his " ears cut, his nose slit, to be branded in the face, " whip'd at a post, to stand on a pillory, to pay 10000 *l.* " fine (tho they knew he was not worth so much) and " to be perpetually imprison'd. The grateful sentence be- " ing past, *Laud* pull'd off his cap, and holding up his " hands, gave thanks to God, who had given him vi- " ctory over his enemies. A Knight moved one of the " Lords about the dreadfulness of the censure, intimating, " that it open'd a gap to the Prelates to inflict such dis- " graceful punishments and tortures upon Men of Qua- " lity. That Lord reply'd, 'twas but *in terrorem*, and " that he would not have any one think, that the sen- " tence should ever be executed.

" Nevertheless, *Laud* had his designs. For upon the " 26 of *November*, 1630. the censure was executed in a " most cruel manner. His ears were cut off, his nose " slit, his face branded with burning irons, he was tied " to a post, and whip'd with a treble cord, to that cruel " degree, that he himself writing the history thereof ten " years after, affirm'd, that every lash brought away the " flesh, and that he should feel it to his dying day. He " was lastly put in the pillory, and kept there near two " hours in frost and snow: and then, after this barbarous " usage, not permitted to return to his quarters in the " *Fleet*, in a coach provided to carry him; but com- " pell'd, in that sad condition and severe season, to go by " water.

" After this, he was kept ten weeks in dirt and mire, " not being shelter'd from rain and snow. They shut him " up most closely 22 months: and he remain'd a prisoner " ten or eleven years, not suffer'd to breath in the open " air, until the Parliament of 1640. most happily deliver'd " him. When he came abroad, to prosecute his Petition " to that Parliament, he could neither go, see, nor hear."

This account I have the rather transcrib'd, that I might set out Archbishop *Laud* in his proper colours, since he was the principal author of all this barbarity, however Dr. *Nichols* afterwards commends him for *his extraordinary learning and admirable piety*; in whom he says he can see *nothing to be blam'd, but only an untimely zeal of raising*

raising the honour of the Church, and endeavouring an uniformity of worship in a season which would not bear it.

I would only add, that tho' Dr. *Nichols* has very falsly represented the sense of *Leighton*'s Book, yet he is to be excus'd, because 'tis evident he took his account from Dr. *Heylyn*, who has the very expressions the Dr. uses. * And 'tis no wonder to meet with the grossest misrepresentations of adversaries in that author. Indeed he led me into a mistake, by asserting he was a Doctor of Physic by profession, whereas he was a Doctor of Divinity.

In the next place Dr. *Nichols* makes heavy complaints of the *warm disputes that happen'd about the Lord's Day, and Predestination.* † MDCXXXIII.

That the true state of our case at that time may be rightly understood, I must observe to the reader, that the great design of Archbishop *Laud*'s faction was to set up an *English*, and not an *Italian* kind of Popery. Hence they endeavour'd to bring in a multitude of the old superstitions and idolatries, and to secure intirely to themselves that power which had been taken from the Pope. And this I do not assert, barely from the writings of the Puritans, but from the speeches of our wisest and best Senators, made in the two Houses of Parliament; and from those matters of fact, which were fully prov'd at the condemnation of Archbishop *Laud*; and from the writings of Dr. *Heylyn*, and others of the same stamp with him. While this design of theirs was carrying on, that they might the easier, and without any disturbance accomplish it, they persecuted the Puritans with the utmost rage and barbarity, and at the same time stifled all books written against the Papists. The Bishops Chaplains, without whose leave no book could then be publish'd, or old one reprinted, would grant their licence to no book, without first reading it, and blotting out, or at least altering whatever they found therein said against the Papists: which was an art they borrow'd of the Papists, whose *Indices Expurgatorii* are used just in the same manner. But whatever restraint was laid upon the books of Protestants, those of Papists, written in the behalf of their superstition, were publish'd without any difficulty: and indeed all things were manag'd according to their hearts desire. Al-

* *See* Life of Laud, *p.* 198. † *Page* 43, 44, 45.

tars were every where ſet up, rail'd in, and men requir'd to pay their reverence to them, as of old to the Calves of *Dan* and *Bethel*; and abundance of other things, ſavouring of nothing but Romiſh ſuperſtition, were every where injoin'd; and all ſuch were barbarouſly worry'd, who would not tamely ſubmit to thoſe arbitrary and lawleſs impoſitions.

Moreover, the Papiſts judging *Arminianiſm* would prove the moſt ſure remedy againſt our Hereſy, and that they might with more ſafety ſpread that doctrine, flock'd hither in great numbers. Nor were they deceiv'd in their expectations, for it ſoon took deep root, and brought forth much fruit; as appear'd not only by experience, but by the teſtimony of a *Jeſuit*, whoſe Letter concerning it was happily intercepted. In a very ſhort ſpace of time, multitudes of the Clergy were leven'd with that doctrine. So eaſily did they yield themſelves a prey to the Papiſts, who ſhew'd themſelves rigid and ſour enough to the Puritans. But yet ſeveral brave men, both among the Biſhops and inferior Clergy, famous for learning and piety, earneſtly oppos'd and refuted this new doctrine to the ſatisfaction and joy of many good men. But theſe innovators diſtruſting the ſucceſs of that kind of conteſt, betook themſelves to a much more politic device; which they afterward were diſpleas'd with, when they ſaw it turn'd againſt themſelves, in the reign of King *James* II. They abuſing therefore that intereſt they had with King *Charles*, perſuaded him to interpoſe his authority in this controverſy, and utterly to forbid all handling theſe points of Divinity. The King comply'd with their deſire, thinking perhaps, and as they without all doubt cunningly ſuggeſted to him, that by this means he ſhould conſult the peace and agreement of his ſubjects. Hereupon concluding they had gain'd their point, they became moſt intolerably inſolent and arbitrary in their management. They ſhut the pulpit and the preſs againſt the *Calviniſts*, but left both wide open to the *Arminians*. And if a *Calviniſt*, with ever ſo great modeſty, declar'd his judgment; he was preſently accus'd of contemning his Majeſty's authority, and was ſure to ſuffer ſeverely for it: whereas an *Arminian* might, without any hazard, not only declare his judgment; but uſe the ſharpeſt invectives againſt thoſe that differ'd from him. And by this means the old doctrine of the Church of *England*, which had been receiv'd from the time of her

firſt

firſt Reformation, was ſupplanted by theſe new ſchemes. They borrow'd another ſtratagem likewiſe from the Papiſts, and by introducing ignorance and impiety, endeavour'd to prepare men for the embracing any kind of ſuperſtition. For this end afternoon Sermons on the Lord's Day, and all Lectures on the week days were put down. Miniſters were commanded to hear children the Catechiſm on the Lord's Day, but were not allow'd to add any explication of it. In the room of theſe afternoon Sermons, on the Lord's Day, were ſubſtituted games, and dancing, according to the laudable exemple of the antients, whether Chriſtians or Pagans it matters not.

To promote theſe, a Royal Declaration was put forth by the Church's Martyr, and all parochial Miniſters were requir'd to publiſh it in their congregations. Who now can wonder that ſuch proceedings ſhould cauſe diſturbance? It could hardly happen otherwiſe, and eſpecially in our nation at that time, when all pious men bore an implacable hatred againſt Popery, and whatever had any tendency thereunto.

Between the Churchmen and the Puritans there had been no controverſy in matters of doctrine, from the beginning of the Reformation to this time, as appears by the writings of both ſides, and is atteſted by Biſhop *Carleton*, and Mr. *Crackanthorp*. And therefore all the diſturbances that follow'd are intirely owing to the eccleſiaſtical innovations of ſome Biſhops, and their wicked attempts to undermine our civil liberties.

The opinion of the Puritans concerning the Lord's Day, was the ſame with that of the old Church of *England*; as appears by the Homilies, and that Prayer which in their Liturgy they teach the people to uſe, after the reading of the fourth Commandment: *Lord have mercy upon us, and incline our hearts to keep this law.* For who would teach the people to pray after that rate, if he thought the law itſelf was aboliſh'd? Nay, and when Biſhop *Barlow* repreſents Dr. *Raynolds*, as complaining in the *Hampton Court Conference* of the profanation of the Lord's Day, and deſiring a Reformation of that abuſe, he ſays: "Unto this "he found a general and unanimous aſſent." *

* P. 45.

The writings of those who abet these proceedings, make it very probable, that one chief design of them was to establish their own authority. They endeavour'd, upon this account, to make the religious observation of the Lord's Day depend upon the same authority with their own prescrib'd Fasts and Festivals. They chose therefore that the Lord's Day should be abominably profan'd, rather than their own institutions should be neglected. Wherein they follow'd the venerable example of those, who *made the commandment of God of no effect by their tradition.* *

I don't think it worth while to inquire, whether this were owing to Archbishop *Laud*'s advice, or not. 'Tis certain, at that time nothing hardly was done, which he was unacquainted with, or disapprov'd. And if the King's administration in this matter was amiss, the fault, according to our laws, fell upon *Laud*, who publish'd the Declaration, and sent it about, when he should have rather dissuaded his Majesty from those proceedings. And what was *Laud*'s opinion, may be easily gather'd from his treatment of Judge *Richardson*, for discouraging the profanation of the Lord's Day, and suppessing the tumults occasion'd thereby. Dr. *Nichols* says: *This Proclamation might in some measure be defended.* † But there being no strength in his arguments, I shall content myself with saying, it ought in all respects to be condemn'd. And the Puritan Ministers acted honestly and bravely, in refusing to publish it in their congregations: and had as good reason (to say the least) on their side, as the Ministers of the Church of *England* had since, for refusing to read in the Churches King *James* the Second's Declaration for liberty of conscience.

Finally, we appeal to all Foreigners of whatever persuasion, *Calvinists* and *Arminians*. Let them read over the XXXIX Articles, and then give judgment, who are in the wrong; whether the Puritans, who subscribing those Articles, embrace the Calvinistical scheme; or the Conformists, who put an Arminian meaning upon Articles, which assert the Calvinian doctrines, and subscribe them in a sense quite contrary to the words wherein they are express'd.

Some

* Matth. xv. 6. † *Page* 44.

Some diſputes aroſe between the King and Parliament, concerning the extent of the prerogative, and the rights of the people; the Epiſcoparians, for the moſt part, take the ſide of the Court, and the Puritans ſtand up for the People. * MDCXL.

The Epiſcoparians then took the ſide of the Court, becauſe the Court took theirs, and was for advancing the Clergy, that the Clergy might advance the prerogative. For they uſe to regard their own intereſt more than the merits of any cauſe. And the ſame party, who in King *Charles* the Firſt's time took the court ſide, afterwards in the reign of King *James* II. when the like controverſy aroſe concerning the liberty of the people, wherein they ſaw their own intereſt at ſtake, took the other ſide, and ſtood up for the people. But pray mind what follows, and ſee how prettily he ſtrokes his own party, and laſhes ours.

But no Tribunitian power ever blow'd up ſuch fires in a commonwealth, and ſo ſtirr'd up the people to popular fury, as many (it grieves me to mention it) of the Puritanical Miniſtry. But with the good leave of theſe Gentlemen; who were they that ſet up themſelves for ſuch Cenſors? who, that occaſion'd *popular fury?* They who taught the people to obey the King, and the laws of the land; or they who told them they muſt obey the King, in oppoſition to the laws? Who *blow'd up fires?* They who defended the rights of the people, which were unjuſtly invaded; or they who endeavour'd in their ſermons utterly to overthrow all ſuch rights? 'Tis notorious to all the world, that the Epiſcopal Miniſters firſt attempted the ſubverſion of our laws and civil liberties; and that the Puritans never attempted to meddle in that controverſy, till they were thus provok'd by their adverſaries. And ſince King *Charles* I. would never have invaded the liberties of the people, if he had not rely'd upon the aſſiſtance and defence of his eccleſiaſtics; they ſurely, above all Men, deſerve the honour of being ſtil'd *incendiaries.* But our Author goes on:

The great fault indeed of ſome of our Clergy was, that they taught an obedience to the Prince, farther than perhaps was agreeable to the conſtitution of a free people. How happy

* *Page* 45.

py is it for us, that our Adverſaries will vouchſafe to own, they ever did any thing amiſs. And truly, I ſhould think, our Author was much to be commended for his ingenuity, if he did not preſently endeavour to extenuate what he here calls a *great fault*. But let us ſee how he excuſes them:

But then this was done at a time when on both ſides their paſſions were too much heated by contentions: If their paſſions were heated *on both ſides*, this will as well excuſe the Puritans (if any fault be charg'd on them) as it will the Epiſcoparians. But whence are we to derive the original cauſe of all that heat? Who were the men who firſt meddled with thoſe matters? *This was done by men who were by profeſſion Divines, and who had not a ſufficient inſight into the laws of the nation:* The being *by profeſſion Divines*, do's not more ſerve to excuſe them, than their Adverſaries. And if they had not *ſufficient inſight into the laws of the nation*; why were they ſo buſy in meddling with what they did not underſtand? But beſides that, thoſe eccleſiaſtics pretended great skill in civil matters; they treated this not as a civil, but a theological diſpute; and, which was a moſt horrid impiety, they father'd their monſtrous opinions upon the ever bleſſed God, and with the utmoſt confidence aſſerted, they were to be believ'd upon pain of eternal damnation. *This was done when Chriſtian Brethren, and the deareſt friends, were juſt running in to worry one another with bloodſhed and ſlaughter.* But how came we to be in any ſuch danger? Whom will our Adverſaries accuſe, as the authors of all this? The Puritans, who defended the laws of the nation; or thoſe, who had but little skill in, and much leſs love to them? Our Adverſaries preach'd their deadly doctrine juſt at that very time, when there was more eſpecial occaſion to inculcate the contrary. Juſt as they lately preach'd up Paſſive Obedience and Nonreſiſtance, like furies, in the reign of Queen *Anne*, when there was not the leaſt ſhadow of any danger; but were as ſilent about it generally, as tho' they had never heard of ſuch doctrines, when a rebellion was actually rais'd againſt his preſent Majeſty King *GEORGE*. Our ſafety and liberty is loſt, and there's an end of all meetings of Parliaments, and the nation muſt be reduc'd to the moſt miſerable ſlavery, whenever a King ſhall have it in his power to lay taxes upon his people, without the conſent of the Parliament. And whenever any Prince attempts

tempts it, 'tis the indiſpenſable duty of all that love their country to oppoſe it. When the laws of the nation, and the rights and privileges of the people are in danger of being ſubverted, then is the time for men to ſtand up in the defence of them: as our Adverſaries at length acknowledg'd in the reign of King *James*, when they themſelves follow'd the noble example the Puritans had ſet them. And tho it muſt be own'd, a civil war is attended with very grievous calamities; yet 'tis to be prefer'd far before ſlavery, which is attended with much worſe.

Now if a pious miſtake ought ever to be forgiven, this error of the Churchmen ought to be pardon'd, by which they endeavour'd to quench that fire which was breaking out in the ſtate, and to prevent the impending ruin of the Church. What ſhall one make of thoſe men, who eſteem the *miſtakes* of their own ſide as *pious*, and traduce the honeſt and noble actions of their Adverſaries as horrid crimes? But let their *miſtake* be eſteem'd *pious*, and ſuch as *ought to be pardon'd:* when men confeſs themſelves in a fault (and, as our Author has call'd it, a *great* one) we are not backward to forgive. But our Adverſaries will by no means forgive the Puritans, that they defended the laws of their country; tho' they were in no *miſtake* at all, not ſo much as a *pious* one.

And truly herein we glory, and, with our Adverſaries good leave, reckon 'twill turn to our everlaſting honour, that our Miniſters undertook the vindication of the laws and liberties of their country. But the Epiſcopal Miniſters were they, who firſt attempted to perſuade their country men to take upon their necks the ſervile yoke; they were the men, who firſt call'd the rights of our Parliaments in queſtion; they firſt preach'd up the abſolute and unlimited power of our Kings, and pav'd a way to the moſt grievous tyranny of our Princes, and the vileſt ſervitude of the people.

This was the courſe taken by *Manwaring* and *Sibthorp*, thoſe vile wretches, whoſe memory is become accurſed to poſterity. By this art they merited their preferment, the former to a Biſhoprick, the latter to a fat living.

But it may perhaps be objected, theſe were private Clergymen, and the whole body of the Clergy is not to be reproach'd with the conduct of one or two particular perſons. Let us then hear the repreſentative bodies of the whole *Engliſh* Clergy, I mean the two Convocations of *Canterbury* and *York*,

York, which, in the year 1640, declar'd themſelves of the ſame opinion. " The moſt high, *ſay they*, and ſacred or-
" der of Kings is of divine right, being the ordinance of
" God Himſelf, founded in the prime laws of nature, and
" clearly eſtabliſh'd by expreſs Texts both of the Old and
" New Teſtaments. A ſupreme power is given to this moſt
" excellent order by God himſelf in the Scriptures, *&c.*" *
If this were true, not only the ſeveral commonwealths abroad, but our own Parliaments here at home, would be contrary to divine inſtitution. A little after they have this Paragraph: " For ſubjects to bear arms againſt their
" Kings, offenſive or defenſive, upon any pretence what-
" ſoever, is at leaſt to reſiſt the powers, which are or-
" dain'd of God. And tho' they do not invade, but only
" reſiſt, St. *Paul* tells them plainly, *They ſhall receive to*
" *themſelves damnation.*" And afterwards the whole body of the Clergy are requir'd to preach this doctrine, or theſe *pious miſtakes*, as our Author calls them. Hence our Adverſaries have uſed to boaſt, that this was the doctrine of the Church of *England*, and to triumph in it, as a glory peculiar and appropriated to themſelves. Nor were they therein in the wrong, or much envied by us. But when they ſaw occaſion to act upon other principles, in the reign of King *James* II, they for ſhame ceas'd their clamors and reproaches upon that head for a conſiderable time, till toward the latter end of Queen *Anne*'s reign: and then they renew'd them with greater fury and madneſs than ever. But ſince the happy acceſſion of his preſent Majeſty King *GEORGE*, they have laid aſide their doctrine again. So occaſional are theſe Gentlemen in their opinions and practices.

What follows in our Author is an harangue, wherein he ſets out the behaviour of the Puritan Miniſters according to the fancies of thoſe of his party, from whom he borrow'd theſe things. Theſe are not the applications of the Miniſters themſelves; but the ſtrain'd and forc'd interpretations their adverſaries put upon their words, even contrary to their expreſs declarations. Thus they commonly deal with *Leighton*, as I ſhew'd before. And ſince the Miniſters always teſtify'd their reſpect to the King, however diſpleas'd they were with the abuſes of his Miniſters, and

* Can. 1.

and the male-administration, I shall not think it worth while to consider his general charges, till I see some particular proofs alledg'd. I own the Ministers heartily espous'd the Parliament side, and went as far as they went in the cause; but neither of them had any designs against the person of the King. And doubtless this is to be remember'd to their honour. And had it not been for the noble stand, then made by the Parliament, and the greatest part of the nation that fell in with them, we must have been utterly inslav'd. I will not deny, that the Ministers in their sermons earnestly recommended to the people the cause, the Parliament had undertaken. And if they exceeded in meddling beyond their function with state affairs; yet I shall not believe, before I see it prov'd, that the Puritan, or those afterward call'd Presbyterian, Ministers can be charg'd with taking the wrong side, or advancing any thing inconsistent with the laws of our country.

Evil men and seducers, the Apostles says, *wax worse and worse*:* and so it prov'd with our adversaries, their superstitions and approaches to *Rome*, their persecuting and violence were now much advanc'd. Many things might be produc'd of this nature. Private Clergymen set up Images, plac'd their Communion Tables altarwise, and forc'd people to the idolatry of bowing to them; press'd their people to confess their sins, and preach'd up their own power of absolving. If any oppos'd them, they fell under their wrath and fury. Ministers were silenc'd, sequester'd, and depriv'd; and the Laity excommunicated, imprison'd, plunder'd and ruin'd. A son was excommunicated for repeating a sermon to his own father, who was under the sentence of excommunication.†

The Articles against Bishop *Wren* are very remarkable, for the account they give of his superstition and tyranny. But I shall only mention two of them:

Art. 13. "that during the time of his being Bishop "of *Norwitch*, which was about two years and 4 months, "there were, for not reading the second service at the "Communion Table, set altarwise, for not reading the "Book of Sports, for using conceiv'd Prayers before and "after sermons, and for not observing some other illegal "into

* 2 Tim. iii. 13. † Rushworth's Collect. Part 3. *p.* 181.

" innovations, by him and his under Officers, by and " upon his directions and injunction, ſundry godly, pain " ful, preaching Miniſters, to the number of fifty, ex- " communicated, ſuſpended or depriv'd, and otherwiſe " cenſur'd and ſilenc'd, to the undoing of many of them, " their wives and children. They could not be abſolv'd " without giving promiſe to conform to his directions, " *editis & edendis*; by means whereof ſome Miniſters were " forc'd to depart this realm; and others of *Norwitch*, " to remove into other peaceable Dioceſſes; and ſome of " them ſo proſecuted, as hath been ſuſpected to be the " cauſe of their deaths. The terrour of which proceed- " ing hath cauſed other miniſters to leave their Cures, " and go away: and if a ſtranger preached at the Cure of " ſuch a parſon ſuſpended, the Churchwardens, permit- " ting ſuch Parſon ſo to preach, were enjoin'd penance, " and otherwiſe troubled."

Art. 16. " That by reaſon of rigorous proſecutions, *&c.* " many of his Majeſty's ſubjects, to the number of three " thouſand, many of which uſed trades, ſpinning, wea- " ving, knitting, and making of cloth, ſtuff, ſtockings, " and other manufactures of wool, ſome of them ſetting " an hundred poor people on work, have remov'd them- " ſelves, their families and eſtates into *Holland*, and other " parts beyond the ſeas, and there ſet up and taught the " natives there the ſaid manufactures, to the great hin- " drance of trade in this kingdom, and to the impo- " veriſhing, and bringing to extream want, very many " who were by thoſe parties formerly ſet on work, to " the great perjudice of his Majeſty and his people."*

By this ſpecimen we may judge what caſe the nation was in, by reaſon of many ſuch Biſhops at that time.

This year Dr. *Baſtwick*, Mr. *Burton*, and Mr. *Prynne*, were releas'd from their impriſonment.† I ſhall therefore here give as conciſe an account as I can of their long and grievous ſuffering.

Mr. *Burton*, a Divine, and Mr. *Prynne*, a Lawyer, had anger'd the Arminian party by the Books which they had publiſh'd againſt them; and were therefore proſecuted in the High Commiſſion, but deliver'd by Prohibitions from the Temporal Courts. This exaſperated *Laud* and his party,

* Ibid. *p.* 353. † *See* the new Diſcovery of the Prelates Tyranny.

party, who watch'd for an opportunity of being reveng'd.

In the year 1632, Mr *Prynne* publish'd a Book against Interludes, intituled *Histriomastix*, licenc'd by Archbishop *Abbot*'s Chaplain. Six weeks after, the Queen acted a part in a Pastoral at *Somerset House*. And there being some passages in the Book against women Actors, and particularly in the Table at the end of the Book, a reference made in these words: *Woman Actors notorious whores:* it was suggested to their Majesties, that these were design'd against the Queen. At which they were incensed, till they were better inform'd of the Book's being publish'd before any one thought of the Queen's acting. Upon this Bishop *Laud* set Dr. *Heylyn* to collect such passages out of the Book, as might draw him into question for suppos'd scandals therein of the King, Queen, state and government of the realm. "After this, *says* Heylyn *himself*, the collect or re-"ceiv'd a further order to review his Notes, and deduct "out of them such logical inferences and conclusions, as "might, and did naturally arise on these dangerous pre-"mises."

Upon this he was imprison'd by a warrant utterly illegal, no mention being made in it of the reason of his commitment. Bishop *Laud*'s hand was to the warrant, and he procur'd this barbarous sentence to be pass'd upon him in the *Star Chamber:* That he should be committed to prison during life, pay a fine of 5000 *l.* to the King, be expell'd *Lincolns Inn*, disbar'd and disabled ever to exercise the profession of a Barrester, be degraded by the University of *Oxford* of his degree there taken; and that done, be set in the pillory at *Westminister*, with a paper on his head declaring the nature of his offence, and have one of his ears there cut off, and at another time be set in the pillory in *Cheapside*, with a paper as aforesaid, and there have his other ear cut off, and his Books at the same time burnt before his face. And all this was done upon Dr. *Heylyn*'s inferences and conclusions: and no passage of his Book was laid in the information brought against him. But the punctilio's of law were a trifle to those men, who bid open defiance both to justice and humanity. The Queen interceeded with the King to remit the execution of the sentence; but *Laud*'s interest was such, as that he got

[2] Life of Laud, *p.* 830

got all the corporal puniſhment inflicted to a tittle. And preſently after, contrary to law, ſeiz'd a cart-load of his books. And when *Prynne* complain'd of it, *Laud* falſely deny'd in open court, that his hand was to the warrant, and promis'd preſent reſtitution of the books; but underhand give order to detain them till they were extended, and ſold toward paying his fine in the *Star Chamber*.

While he lay in priſon, Dr. *Baſtwick*, a Phyſician at *Colcheſter*. publiſh'd a Book, call'd: *Elenchus Religionis Papiſticæ:* with an Addition thereunto, call'd: *Flagellum Pontificis & Epiſcoporum Latialium.* He declar'd in his Preface, he meant not ſuch Biſhops, as acknowledg'd their authority from Kings and Emperors. In his Book he argued the parity of the Biſhop of *Rome*, and all other Biſhops and Presbyters. Hereupon a Purſevant from the High Commiſſion Court came and ranſack'd his houſe, broke open his ſtudy, and carry'd away books, writings, letters and what he pleas'd. After a long and chargeable ſuit, he was fin'd 1000 *l.* to the King, excommunicated, debar'd to practiſe Phyſic, his ſaid books order'd to be burnt, and himſelf pay coſts of ſuit, and be impriſon'd till he ſhould make a recantation. By virtue of this ſentence he had lain two years in priſon in the *Gatehouſe*, when he wrote his *Apologeticus ad Præſules Anglicanos*, and his *Litany:* which accordingly anger'd the Prelates, and begat him greater troubles.

Mr. *Burton*, on the 5 of *November* 1636, preach'd two Sermons, *For God and the King*, Prov. xxiv. 21. 22. The deſign of theſe was to lay open the innovations, and arbitrary proceedings of the Biſhops. But the ſtile and language of them was indecently ſevere, but yet deſerv'd not ſo terrible a puniſhment, eſpecially conſidering his zeal was provok'd by things ſcandalouſly evil. By the order of *Laud*, now become Archbiſhop, his houſe was broke open, his perſon ſeiz'd, and ſuch books and papers as the Officer though fit, taken away.

While theſe three lay in priſon, there came out two Books; the one intitled: *A Divine Tragedy, containing a catalogue of God's late judgments upon Sabbath-breakers:* the other: *News from* Ipſwich. This latter expos'd the innovations of the Biſhops, and particularly the extravagancies of Biſhop *Wren*. There was no name to them, and the Biſhops being not able to find the author, that they might be reveng'd on him, reſolv'd to make *Prynne* ſmart

ſmart for it. And ſo they exhibited an information againſt theſe three Gentlemen at once in the *Star Chamber*, annexing theſe two laſt nam'd Books, and Dr. *Baſtwick*'s and Mr. *Burton*'s to the information. Neither of theſe Books was particularly charged on Mr. *Prynne* in the information, nor was any witneſs produc'd to prove him the author, or diſperſer of any of them. They were *ſub-pœna'd* to put in their anſwer. They had Counſel aſſign'd them, who being ſeverely threaten'd, dared not ſubſcribe their anſwer, and then their anſwer was refus'd, becauſe it had not any Counſellor's hand to it. And proceeding by ſuch baſe tricks, they took the information *pro confeſſo*. They were fined 5000 *l.* each, to ſtand in the pillory, and have both their ears cut off. Mr. *Prynne* was to have the ſmall remainders of his cut off; to be ſtigmatiz'd in both cheeks with *S. L.* and to be confin'd in *Carnarvan Caſtle* during life. Mr. *Burton*, to be depriv'd of his Benefice, degraded from his miniſterial function, and degrees taken in the Univerſity, and confin'd to perpetual impriſonment in *Lancaſter Caſtle*. Dr. *Baſtwick*, to be cloſe priſoner in *Lanceſton Caſtle* in *Cornwal*. They were debar'd the uſe of pen, ink and Paper; none ſuffer'd to come at them, not ſo much as the wives of the two latter. By ſending them to ſuch remote places, they propos'd to put them to the greateſt hardſhips. But as revenge is an inſatiable paſſion, they could not be content herewith; but contrary to the ſentence given, they order'd them, in an extrajudicial, arbitrary manner, to be tranſported; *Prynne* to *Jerſey*, *Burton* to *Guernſey*, and *Baſtwick* to the Iſland of *Scilly*. In their ſeveral confinements they met with barbarous uſage, which continued till the Parliament did them right. The noble behaviour of theſe three perſons, when they ſuffer'd, is too long to be tranſcrib'd, but well worth reading: my deſign is to lay open the perſecutions of that time.

I cannot omit mentioning the barbarity uſed upon the occaſion of Mr. *Prynne*'s journey to *Carnarvan*.* Being at *Coventry* in his way, on a Lord's Day, he went to Church, and ſome of his friends (asking leave of his keepers, who ſaid they had no orders to the contrary) viſited him. For this Archbiſhop *Laud* ſends a meſſenger

* New Diſcovery, &c. p. 91, &c.

for them, and when he had check'd them, and put them to two or three hundred pounds charge, he dismiss'd them.

But his friends at *Chester* could not come off so easily. Mr. *Calvin Brewen* accidentally overtaking him upon the road, rode with him into *Chester*. He, and some of Mr. *Prynne*'s acquaintance, came to see him in his inne, and next day went with him to buy some bedding and furniture for his chamber at *Carnarvan*, where such things could not be gotten. And when he went out of *Chester*, some three or four of his friends conducted them over the washes, which were dangerous (none of his guard knowing the way) they brought them on four or five miles, and bestow'd a cup of wine and some cold meat upon his guard, and so went back.

This the stiffest Churchmen in the nation, ever since Dr. *Sacheverel*'s famous progress, must own to be a trifle of an offence; and yet for this they were treated very hardly. The Bishop of *Chester* order'd his Clergy to preach against them, and sent a complaint of it to the Archbishop of *Canterbury*. By his direction they were put into the High Commission at *York*, and there fined; some 500, some 300, some 250 pounds. They were imprison'd, and forc'd to enter bond in 300 *l.* apiece, to stand to the farther order of the Court, and to make such a public acknowledgment of this great crime, both in the Cathedral Church at *Chester*, before the congregation there, and likewise in the *Town Hall* before the Mayor, Aldermen, and citizens, as the Commissioners should prescribe them. When I read such things as these, and consider that our Blessed Saviour well understood with what an implacable bitterness his Disciples would be persecuted, I the less wonder that so much notice will be taken in the great day of those, who, *when his brethren were in prison, came to them.* * I wish men of a persecuting spirit would seriously consider the other part of the representation of the proceedings of that day.

MDCXLI. In this year was the dreadful massacre in *Ireland*, wherein two hundred thousand Protestants were murder'd. "The Rebels pretended they "had the King's commission for what they did. Many "thought

* Matth. xxv. 36. 40.

" thought they bely'd the King herein; till afterwards, in " the reign of King *Charles* the Second, the Marquefs of " *Antrim*, a ringleader of the Rebels, fued to have his " eftate, which had been fequeftred, reftor'd to him. " The Duke of *Ormond* and the Council in *Ireland* judg'd " againft him, as one of the Rebels. Whereupon, he " brought his caufe over to the King, and affirm'd, that " what he did was by his Father's confent and authority. " The King refer'd it to fome worthy Members of his " Privy Council, to examine what he had to fhew. " Upon examination they reported, that they found " he had the King's confent, or Letter of inftructions " for what he did: which amaz'd many. Hereupon " King *Charles* wrote to the Duke of *Ormond* to reftore " his eftate, becaufe it appear'd what he did was by his " Fathers order, or confent. The Lord *Mazarine*, and " others in *Ireland*, not fully fatisfied with this, thought " fit fo far to profecute the matter, as that the Marquefs " of *Antrim* was forc'd to produce in the Houfe of Com- " mons a Letter of K. *Charles* I, by which he gave him order " for the taking up arms, which being read in the Houfe " produc'd a great filence." * He that would be fatisfied in this matter, fhould read the Letter which K. *Charles* II. wrote to the Duke of *Ormond*, and the Lords of the Council in *Ireland*, which Mr. *Ludlow* has publifh'd in his *Memoirs*. † I fhall only tranfcribe the account the King gives them of the report of the Lord's of the Privy Council, to whom he had refer'd the examination of that matter. " Our Lord Referees, after feveral meetings, and having " perus'd what had been offer'd to them by the faid Mar- " quefs, have repreferted to us, that they have feen fe- " veral Letters, all of them of the hand writing of our " Royal Father to the faid Marquefs, and feveral inftru- " ctions concerning his treating and joining with the " *Iriſh*, in order to the King's fervice, by reducing them " to their obedience, and by drawing fome forces " from them for the fervice of *Scotland*. And that be- " fide the Letters and Orders under his Majefties hand, " they have fufficient evidence and teftimony of feveral " meffages and directions fent from our Royal Father, " and our Royal Mother with the privity and direction of

* Calamy's Abridgm. *p.* 44. † *Vol.* 3. *p.* 353.

" the King our Father; by which they are perſuaded, that " whatever intelligence, correſpondence, or actings the " ſaid Marqueſs had with the confederate *Iriſh* Catholics, " was directed or allow'd by the ſaid letters, inſtructions " and directions; and it manifeſtly appear'd to them, that " the King our Father was well pleas'd with what the " Marqueſs did, after he had done it, and approv'd the " ſame." This Letter was read twice in one day in the *Court of Claims* in *Ireland* before thouſands of people; and among the reſt a perſon of quality, whoſe papers I have uſed, who then took a copy of it; and heard eight of the twelve qualifications (any one of which being prov'd againſt a perſon, he was to be declar'd nocent, and his eſtate forfeited) prov'd upon him by ſubſtantial evidence; as that by his commiſſion many thouſand head of cattle were driven away, and the people murder'd; that in the town of *Caſhol*, near *Clonmel*, in the county of *Tiperary*, by his commiſſion 1200 throats of men, women, and children were cut in one night, in cold blood; with others of the ſame nature. But the Commiſſioners would not hear any more, Sir *William Dunvil* ſaying, the deſign was to wound the King thro the Marqueſs of *Antrim*'s ſides. And tho he was general of the army of the *Iriſh* Rebels, and the Duke of *Ormond* of the Proteſtant army, they two were both declar'd innocent in one day.

This accident of *Ireland*, my Lord *Clarendon* tells us, was of infinite diſadvantage to the Kings affairs.* Nay, he ſays: " It was *Ireland* that drew the firſt blood, and " if they had not at that time rebell'd, and in that man- " ner, 'tis very probable, all the miſeries which afterwards " befell the King, and his dominions, had been prevented."† He ſays: " It was inſinuated into the minds of the people, " that this rebellion was contriv'd and fomented by the " King, or at leaſt by the Queen, for the advancement of Po- " pery, and that the Rebels publiſh'd and declar'd, that they " had the King's authority for all they did. *He owns*, this " made more impreſſion upon the minds of ſober and mode- " rate men, than could be then imagin'd, or can yet be be- " liev'd."‖ Yet he calls it a calumny, without the leaſt ſha- dow or colour of truth. But whether he ſays this with as much reaſon as aſſurance, the reader muſt judge. And that there

* *Vol.* 1. *p.* 299. 8*vo.* Edition, † *Vol.* 3. *p.* 574. ‖ *Vol.* 1. *p.* 301.

there was at leaſt *ſome colour or ſhadow of truth* in this, ſeems plain from what is related by himſelf. It was certainly a very conſiderable circumſtance the Parliament took notice of: "That the Proclamation where-"by they were declar'd traitors, was ſo long withheld, "as to the ſecond of *January*, tho the rebellion broke "forth in *October* before; and then no more than forty "copies appointed to be printed, with a ſpecial command "from his Majeſty not to exceed that number, and that "none of them ſhould be publiſh'd, till his Majeſty's "pleaſure were further ſignified; as by the warrant ap-"pears: ſo that a few only could take notice of it, which "was made more obſervable by the late contrary pro-"ceedings againſt the *Scots*, who were in a very quick "and ſharp manner proclaim'd; and thoſe Proclamations "forthwith diſpers'd, with as much diligence as might be, "throughout all the kingdom, and order'd to be read in "all Churches, accompanied with public prayers and "execrations." * The King's anſwer to this ſeems very unſatisfactory. † And all thoſe reaſons which his Majeſty alledges for theſe kind of proceedings in the *Iriſh* buſineſs, had no manner of influence upon him in the leſs dangerous affair of *Scotland*; and this he ſeems to have been ſenſible of, and therefore would not meddle with the compariſon, or attempt to give a reaſon for the difference of his conduct. Beſides, we have the more reaſon to believe the account K. *Charles* the Second's Letter gives us, from what my Lord *Clarendon* himſelf relates of the carriage of the King toward the Marqueſs of *Antrim* afterward. For two years after the rebellion, when the King was at *Oxford*, he imploy'd this Earl of *Antrim*, together with *Daniel O Neile*, another Papiſt, to go and make levies of the *Iriſh* to tranſport them into *Scotland*, as they actually did. ‖ And for his incouragement he then created him a Marqueſs, as *O Neile* was made at the ſame time Groom of the Bed-chamber. And I hardly think any Man will much credit his Lordſhip, that *Antrim's* correſpondence with the rebels was not known, when he came to *England*. ‡ But I make no doubt my Lord *Clarendon* was one of the Lords Referees, ſpoken of in K. *Charles* the Second's Letter, and underſtood this matter better than his Hiſtory, as it now appears, would make us believe.

* *Vol.* 1. *p.* 550. † *Vid. p.* 604, 605. ‖ *Vol.* 2. *p.* 609, &c. ‡ *Vol.* 2. *p.* 609.

But be that as 'twill, 'tis certain the *Engliſh* were ſtruck with a great dread; partly by the maſſacre itſelf, and partly by the threatnings of the *Iriſh* cut-throats; who openly declar'd, that as ſoon as they had diſpatch'd the ſmall remnant left in *Ireland*, they would come into *England*, and deal in like manner with the Parliament, and *Engliſh* Proteſtants.

What our author ſays about the civil war, is, I think, foreign to our matter; ſince the cauſe of civil liberty, rather than religion, was the occaſion of it. It cannot ſeem ſtrange, if a civil war be accompany'd with diſmal calamities; but yet ſlavery, as I ſaid before, is attended with worſe. I paſs over what he ſays of rabbles, whoſe defence I will never undertake; altho 'tis very certain they were provok'd to what they did by the cruelty of ſome Biſhops, who in cold blood acted as bad as any thing done in that diſturbance. And if the Tranſlator ever took any liberty, he ſhould have done it here, modeſty requiring him to paſs over theſe rabbles and tumults in ſilence; ſince he knows in his conſcience, his own party have lately, without any ſhadow of a provocation, abundantly exceeded all that was ever done before of that kind in this nation.

But however I paſs over theſe things, I think I ought to do juſtice to the memory of a Miniſter injur'd by him.

Burgeſs, ſays he, *a Puritan Miniſter, irritates a rabble which he had brought out of the city, in the head whereof he himſelf appears, which lays ſiege to the doors of the Parliament Houſe, where roaring againſt the Biſhops and their friends, and threatning them with hard words, ſo ſcares them, that they had not the liberty of giving their ſuffrages as they would.* * I doubt not our Author is miſtaken herein. Neither *Heylyn*, *Fuller*, nor my Lord *Clarendon* give this account of him. And indeed the ringleader of that rabble, that petition'd againſt the Biſhops, was Sir *Richard Wiſeman*, who was himſelf ſlain by a ſtone from off *Weſtminſter Abbey Walls*. And if thoſe, who then oppos'd High Church, did ill in coming ſo tumultuouſly to the Parliament Houſe; why did High Church, who ſo freely blame them, afterwards follow their example, during the trial

* *Page* 48.

trial of their late incendiary? And why have mobs and tumults been encourag'd thro the whole nation ever ſince?

I cannot here forbear tranſcribing a part of my Lord *Digby*'s Speech upon the occaſion of this Petition. A great ſtickler he was for Biſhops, and was in that very ſpeech earneſtly pleading in their behalf; but yet ſo flagrant and notorious was their tyranny, that he could not ſpeak of it without indignation. Being a friend, his teſtimony may be the more readily believ'd, ſince it cannot be thought, he would beyond truth aggravate the crimes of thoſe he was pleadidg for.

" Mr. *Speaker*, *ſays he*, you ſee in what plain language " I have ſet forth unto you the faults of this Petition; " notwithſtanding, as great as they are, ſo they may not " obtain any ſeeming countenance from us, I find myſelf " willing to have them paſs'd by; eſpecially when I con- " ſider how naturally prone all mankind is, when it finds " itſelf oppreſs'd beyond all patience, to fly unto extreams " for eaſe; and indeed I do not think any people hath " been ever more provok'd, than the generality of *Eng-* " *land* of late years, by the inſolencies and exorbitances " of the Prelates.

" I proteſt ſincerely, Mr. *Speaker*, I cannot caſt my eye " upon this Petition, nor my thoughts, on the practices " of the Churchmen, that have govern'd it of late, but " they appear'd to me as a ſcourge imploy'd by God upon " us, for the ſins of the nation; and I could not but " think of that paſſage in the Book of *Kings*: *He that* " *eſcapeth the ſword of* Hazael, *ſhall* Jehu *ſlay*; *and he* " *that eſcapeth* Jehu, *ſhall* Eliſha *ſlay*.

" Methinks, the vengeance of the Prelates hath been ſo " layed, as if 'twere meant, no generation, no degree, " no complexion of mankind ſhould eſcape it.

" Was there a man of nice and tender conſcience? Him " they afflicted with ſcandal in *adiaphoris*, impoſing on " him thoſe things as neceſſary, which he thinks unlaw- " ful, and they themſelves knew to be indifferent.

" Was there a man of legal conſcience, that made the " eſtabliſhment by law the meaſure of his religion? Him " they netled with innovations, with freſh introductions " to Popery.

" Was there a man of a meek and humble ſpirit? Him " they have trampled to dirt in their pride.

" Was there a man of a proud and arrogant nature? " Him they have bereft of reason, with indignation at " their superlative insolence about him.

" Was there a man peaceably affected, studious of the " quiet and tranquillity of his country? Their incendiar- " ships have plagued him.

" Was there a man faithfully addicted to the right of " the crown, loyally affected to the King's supremacy? " How hath he been gall'd by their new oath, a direct " covenant against it?

" Was there a man tenacious of the liberty and proper- " ty of the subject? Have they not set forth Books, or " Sermons, or Canons destructive to them all?

" Was there a man of a pretty sturdy conscience, that " would not blanch for a little? Their pernicious oath " hath made him sensible and wounded; or, I fear, pre- " par'd him for the Devil.

" Was there a man that durst mutter against their inso- " lencies? He may inquire for his *lugs*, they have been " within the Bishops visitation: as if they would not on- " ly derive their brandishment of the spiritual sword from " St. *Peter*, but of the material one too, and the right to " cut off ears.

" Mr. Speaker, as dully, as faintly, as unlively, as in " language these actions of the Relates have been ex- " press'd to you; I am confident there is no man hears " me, but is brimfull of indignation.

" For my part, I profess, I am so enflam'd with the " sense of them, that I find my self ready to cry out with " the loudest of the 15000: Down with them, Down " with them to the very ground. " *

Our Author next complains of twelve Bishops being impriſon'd, upon their protesting against the acts made in their absence. But as this was done by the Parliament, so there is no body now, who pretends to justify the protestation of the Bishops, nor does my Lord *Clarendon* himself. And as to Archbishop *Laud*, whom he commends in the next passage; I leave it to every one to judge as he sees cause. I own, I look upon him to have been most superstitious, haughty and cruel, and the prime cause of all the distractions at that time. And let but the reader review

* Rushworth's Collect. *Part* 3. *p.* 172.

view my Lord *Digby*'s ſpeech, and remember that the Archbiſhop was the ringleader of the Biſhops, and then he may form a truer notion of him, than our Author ſeems to have done.

And now all England *was defil'd with civil blood:* * Which cannot be ſtrange in the time of a civil war. *Neither are the Churches ſpar'd in the unnatural rage.* 'Tis no unuſual thing for ſoldiers to ſpoil Churches. The Royaliſts then did the ſame. † The like was done by our ſoldiers, who were Churchmen, after the famous Battle at *Hochſtet*. And what can any man ſay in defence of that ungodly fury, which has rag'd now for ſeveral years in our High Churchmen; who have made it their practice to commit felony, treaſon and ſacrilege in ſpoiling our Churches? But I would here further obſerve, that our pariſh Churches were horribly polluted with abundance of ſuperſtitious trinkets retain'd in them, or then lately brought in, under a pretence of adorning them. And there being an order of Parliament for the removing ſuch kind of things, there could ſo far be no hurt in it. ‖ *For oftentimes the glaſs windows of Churches, painted with the moſt exquiſite are, are broken by the rabble, or the ſoldiers; ſome of the Puritanical Miniſters, who were Chaplains in the army, at the ſame time ſtanding by, and exhorting them to it.* I don't remember to have met with this charge upon the Puritanical Miniſters in any of our Hiſtorians. But ſuppoſing it true, that they did this by the order of the Parliament, and did it without any tumult; I think it ſhould be look'd upon as matter of commendation, rather than diſgrace to them. And herein they really follow'd the example of our old Reformers. So Mr. *Stype* tells us, in a viſitation, in the year 1559: "They took care to "have all the utenſils, and inſtruments of ſuperſtition and "idolatry demoliſh'd, and deſtroy'd out of the Churches, "where God's pure ſervice was to be ſet up; ſuch as the "*Roods*, that is the Images of Chriſt upon the Croſs, "with *Mary* and *John* ſtanding by; alſo Images of other "Saints, Tutelaries of the Churches, to whom they were "dedicated; Popiſh books, Altars and the like; as know-"ing, that while theſe things remain'd, the practices of "idolatry muſt almoſt neceſſarily be continued among the "igno-

* *Pag* 49. † Clarendon, *Vol.* 2 *p.* 653. ‖ *See Mr.* Baxter's Life, *Part* 1. *p.* 40.

" ignorant people, and the Reformation of religion be " greatly obſtructed." * 'Tis really a great diſgrace to a Reform'd Church, to retain idolatrous pictures in their temples; ſuch as that at *Salisbury*, which repreſented God the Father under the form of an old man, toward which an old woman uſed to make a curſy. This was broken by Mr. *Sherfield*, who was miſerably harraſs'd by Archbiſhop *Laud* upon that account, and had at laſt a fine of 1000 *l.* laid upon him for it. I wiſh our Adverſaries would let us know, by what antiquity they defend themſelves, in retaining and ſetting up ſuch things. The primitive Chriſtians had no ſuch pictures in their places of worſhip. The firſt we read of was at *Anablatha*; concerning which 'tis worth while to hear what *Epiphanius* ſays: " I found there, *ſays he*, hanging at the door of the " Church, a veil with the Image of Chriſt, or ſome Saint " (I don't well remember which) painted upon it. When " therefore I ſaw this, that the image of a man hung " there, contrary to the authority of the Holy Scriptures, " I tore it down, and advis'd thoſe who had the care of " the Church, that they ſhould rather make it a winding " ſheet for ſome poor body that was dead. —— Pleaſe to " accept this veil, which I have ſent by the bearer; and " give order, that hereafter no ſuch veils, as are forbid- " den by our religion, be ſet up in the Church of Chriſt. " For it becometh your goodneſs, to be the rather careful " about this matter, that you may take away that occa- " ſion of ſcruple and doubting, which is unfit for the " Church of Chriſt, and the people committed to your " charge." † And ſince the *Homilies* very much commend this example of *Epiphanius*, I can't imagine why the Church ſhould be angry with the Puritans for following it. But theſe *windows were painted with exquiſite art.* And therefore I ſuppoſe that antient complaint is renew'd, *Matth.* xxvi. 8. *To what purpoſe is this waſt?* Theſe complainers are moſt concern'd about the coſt and worth of theſe things; while the Puritans, above all, minded the honour of our Redeemer, and the purity of Chriſtian worſhip. And truly, when pernicious things are to be deſtroy'd, no regard is to be had to the exquiſiteneſs of the art diſcover'd in them, or to the price of them, *Acts* xix. 19. What

* Life of Grindal, *p.* 25. † Letter to John of Jeruſalem.

What follows in our Author concerning the plundering of Churches, if it is all true, is not ſtrange, as I ſaid before, in a time of war. The ſame, or worſe, was done by their own ſide not long ſince, in the war in *Bavaria*, and at the Fort *St. Mary*. As to the *Veſtments* of the Clergy, the uſe of them was aboliſh'd, and to what purpoſe they ſhould be preſerv'd I don't underſtand; unleſs any ſhould eſteem them ſo ſacred, as ſome have done, who were for burning old Surplices that were worn out; leſt ſuch holy garments ſhould be profan'd, by being apply'd to any common uſe.

Our Author next comes to the *Solemn League and Covenant*, which, he ſays, *was an oath which the Puritans oblig'd themſelves by, to extirpate the order of Biſhops, and to reform the government of the Church according to the Presbyterian diſcipline of the Church of* Scotland. * This is a miſtake, which I ſhall rectify in the words of Mr. *Baxter*. " This Covenant, *ſays he*, was " propos'd by the Parliament to the conſideration of the " Synod at *Weſtminſter*. The Synod ſtumbled at ſome " things in it, and eſpecially at the word *Prelacy*. Dr. " *Burgeſs* the Prolocutor, Mr. *Gataker*, and abundance " more declar'd their judgments to be for Epiſcopacy, e- " ven for the antient moderate Epiſcopacy, in which one " ſtated Preſident, with his Presbytery, govern'd every " Church; tho not for the *Engliſh* Dioceſan frame, in " which one Biſhop, without his Presbytery, did, by a " Lay Chancellor's Court, govern all the Presbyters and " Churches of a Dioceſs, being many hundreds; and that " in a ſecular manner, by abundance of upſtart ſecular " Officers, unknown to the primitive Church. Hereupon " grew ſome debate in the Aſſembly; ſome being againſt " every degree of Biſhops, (eſpecially the *Scotiſh Divines*) " and others being for a moderate Epiſcopacy. But " theſe *Engliſh* Divines would not ſubſcribe the Covenant, " till there were an alteration ſuited to their judgments: " and ſo a *parentheſis* was yielded to, as deſcribing that " ſort of Prelacy which they oppos'd, *viz.* [*that is, Church government by Archbiſhops, Biſhops, Deans and Chapters, Archdeacons, and all other Eccleſiaſtical Officers depending on that Hierarchy.*] All which conjoin'd are men- " tion'd MDCXLIII.

* *Pag.* 50.

" tion'd as the deſcription of that form of Church go-
" vernment, which they meant by *Prelacy*, as not ex-
" tending to the antient Epiſcopacy. When the Covenant
" was taken, the Lords and Commons firſt took it them-
" ſelves; and Mr. *Thomas Coleman* preach'd to the Houſe
" of Lords, and gave it them with this public explica-
" tion: *That by Prelacy we mean not all Epiſcopacy, but*
" *only that form which is here deſcrib'd.*" * Thus far Mr. *Baxter*, who was himſelf of the ſame opinion with Mr. *Gataker*. And the generality of the *Engliſh* Presbyterians, as far as I can judge, don't much differ from them, wiſhing the preſent very corrupt form of Prelacy were aboliſh'd, and the true antient Epiſcopacy reſtor'd.

This oath by an order of Parliament, who now acted without the King, was enjoyn'd to be taken by all Miniſters of pariſhes, and thoſe who refus'd it were to be ejected from their livings. By this Ordinance of the Parliament, in courſe of time, almoſt all the Epiſcopal Clergy were ſequeſter'd or turn'd out. An hundred and fifteen *were depriv'd in the city of* London *only, and in other parts of the nation ſome thouſands.*

If theſe things were all true, they might have pleaded for themſelves, that herein they only follow'd the example the Epiſcopal party had before ſet them. And indeed, I am ſorry that they imitated them ſo much as they did. For it muſt be own'd, that ſeveral, who deſerv'd better treatment, were turn'd out upon this occaſion. But 'tis utterly unreaſonable to ſay, all that were then ſequeſtred or turn'd out, met with this uſage upon the account of their refuſing the Covenant. Many of them were depriv'd for the moſt notorious crimes, which were ſworn againſt them. And beſides, Dr. *Heylyn* is an author who deſerves very little credit, as I obſerv'd before: and yet he, if I miſtake not, is the only writer, whoſe teſtimony Dr. *N.* is able to produce for what he here ſays.

And now by the authority of Parliament, there is a Council of the Puritans conven'd, commonly call'd the Aſſembly of Divines. *In which no Biſhops are allow'd,* [A great miſtake: *Uſher*, *Weſtford*, *Prideaux* and *Browning* were all Biſhops, and yet call'd to the Aſſembly] *but only ſome few Epiſcoparian Divines for countenance ſake, are nominated; who,*

* *His* Life, *Part* 1. *Pag.* 48.

who, because the Synod was call'd without the King's authority, refuse to join themselves with that illegal meeting. To these were added some few of the Sect of the Brownists, *or Independents; for at that time the Puritans thought it not improper to court their favour, for as much as they saw that they every day more and more grew into the esteem of the common people.** To which let us add, what he afterwards mentions: *Some persons of* Erastian *principles were join'd to them; men who were neither for Episcopacy nor Presbytery; but who were dispos'd to receive any government in the Church, which the Parliament thought fit to establish. To these some Laymen were likewise added: The Earl of* Pembroke, *and Lord* Say, *out of the House of Peers; Mr.* Whitlock, *and Mr.* Selden, *out of the House of Commons. This jumble of a Synod made their first Session the first of* July 1643.†

The Assembly was not constituted according to the principles of either the Episcopal, or Presbyterian party. However, no man can with any modesty deny, they were a company of very excellent persons both for learning and piety. Our Parliament was now consulting about a Reformation in religion, wherein they thought they needed the advice of some Divines. And because they did not like a *Synod*, that should make Canons by their own authority, they themselves chose such Divines as they saw fit. They observ'd, Divines were much divided in their opinions, and thought it reasonable the arguments of every party should be weigh'd. Upon this account, they chose the most eminent men of each party and call'd them to the Assembly. There were many *Erastians* at that time; as their Principles had been formerly rife enough in the nation. Archbishop *Whitgift* himself goes much upon those principles, in his writing against *Cartwright*. He is said also to have licens'd *Erastus*'s Book, and writ with his own hand, in one of the Books finely gilt, these words: *Intus quam extra formosior: More beautiful within than without.* But after our High Churchmen had got the whim of the Divine Right of Episcopacy, the number of his followers declin'd. Concerning the Independents, our Author has inserted here a pretty long account. But they will not easily allow, their

* *Pag.* 51. † *p.* 56.

their principles were first started by *Brown*. I shall only give this short account of the rise of them.

The Bishops by their cruelty in persecuting all Protestants who differ'd from them, turn'd the minds of many both against themselves, and the manner of their worship. The Puritans thought a separation was very much to be dreaded; and that they ought to try first what could be done by intreaties, supplications, and such like means. But those who had afterward the name of *Brownists* were more hasty, than perhaps was fitting, in setting up separate congregations. At least the Puritans were of that opinion, and therefore wrote earnestly against them. Whether they were right in this their opinion is to me very questionable, and therefore I will not here interpose my judgment. However that be, a great many of them wearied out with the oppressions and persecutions of the Bishops, left their dear native country, and fled into the wild and desolate regions of *America*; where, in safety from the rage of the Bishops, they worship'd God according to their consciences, and set up a discipline that was not contemptible. *Cotton*, *Elliot*, *Hooker*, and many other most pious Ministers, were among the first that fled thither.

Our Author makes some severe reflections upon Mr. *John Cotton*,* who was a learned and pious man; and therefore I shall say somewhat in his vindication, however I differ from him in many of his opinions. Mr. *Cotton* was not a *Brownist*, as indeed none of the Independents are. This is evident by an Epistle he prefix'd to Mr. *Arthur Hildersham's Lectures upon the Fourth of John*, wherin he has these Words: "Yea, and that one Letter of his [Mr. *Hil-*
" *dersham's*] to a Gentlewoman against the separation,
" which without his consent a Separatist printed and
" refuted, hath so strongly and clearly convinced the
" iniquity of that way, that I could not but acknowledge
" in it both the wisdom of God, and the iniquity of the
" Separatist.---In which respect, I conceive, it was, that
" the industrious Dr. *Willet* stileth this our author: *Schis-*
" *maticorum (qui vulgo Brownistæ) malleum: The ham-*
" *mer of Schismatics, whom they commonly call Brown-*
" *ists.*" This Letter was writ in the year 1629, the year before

* Pag. 53.

before he went for new *England*, according to Dr. *Nichols*. And in the year 1648, he says his judgment was not alter'd in what he had write in that Preface.*

In the Treatise I have now last cited, Mr. *Cotton* has publish'd a most modest defence of himself against such kind of accusations which our Author suggests. As to the charge laid against him about Mrs. *Hutchinson*, he answers: That at her first coming, she was well respected and esteem'd of him, not only because her self and family were well belov'd in *England*, nor only because she and her family went over thither for conscience sake; but chiefly for that he heard she did much good in their town, in womens meeting at childbirth travels, *&c.* After this she turned aside, not only to corrupt opinions, but to disesteem generally the Elders of the Churches, and with cunning arts spread her notions. † This change of hers was long hid from him, and much longer the evidence of it: altho he try'd to discover her, and dealt freely with her concerning several things he dislik'd in her. Not long after, he heard by some of the neighbouring Elders, that Mrs. *Hutchinson* propagated her errors, as tho' they were asserted by himself; wherupon he dealt with her and her associates again, declaring those opinions were erronious, and that he was unjustly pretended to be the author or encourager of them. They, on the other hand, said, they neither held such tenents themselves, nor had they ever father'd them upon him. Mr. *Cotton* reported their answer to his Brethren; and ask'd them, if any two of them, or of their neighbours, could bear witness in this case? They answer'd, they had but one. He then desir'd their advice what he should do. They advis'd him publicly and privately to hear witness against their errors. This he did; and then the followers of *Hutchinson* pretended he said another thing to them in private. At length the Ministers, and especially Mr. *Cotton*, thought it proper to call a Synod. Fourscore of her opinions were propos'd to the Synod to be examin'd by them; and Mr. *Cotton* declar'd his judgment openly before all the assembly: That he esteem'd some of the opinions to be blasphemous; some of them heretical; many of them erroneous; and almost all of them incommodiously express'd.

* Way of the Congreg. Churches clear'd, *p.* 18. † Ibid. *p.* 53.

preſs'd. *Hutchinſon* therefore was requir'd to retract them. She did ſo, but the prefidious wretch at the ſame time declar'd, ſhe had never held them. Of this moſt impudent falſhood ſhe was preſently convicted, and then caſt out of the Church; Mr. *Cotton* and the whole Church, except her own Son, voting for it. So that our Author had little reaſon to repreſent the Independents, as eſteeming *her famous for revelation*; or to ſay, ſhe was *the conſtant companion of Mr.* Cotton, *as formerly* Maximilla *was of* Montanus.

It muſt be own'd, that the ingenious and learned Mr. *Ainſworth*, and ſome other of the old Browniſt writers uſed many expreſſions in their writings againſt their adverſaries, which were ſcandalouſly harſh and ſevere: with which it would be very unreaſonable to charge the Independents in after times. They only now differ from us in ſome notions relating to the diſcipline of the Church; and that difference daily abates. Nor is Mr. *Spanheim* miſtaken in his judgment, who calls them *pious and orthodox*;* and ſays, they only differ from the Preſbyterians in what I juſt now mention'd.

That ſome Laymen were added to the *Aſſembly of Divines* was no new thing in *England*. In the reigns of King *Henry* VIII, and K. *Edward* VI, there were xxxii Commiſſioners appointed to draw up a body of Eccleſiaſtical Laws: and theſe were partly Clergymen, and partly Laymen, as is well known. And beſides that, eccleſiaſtical laws are daily made by our Parliaments, which conſiſt of ſome Biſhops, and the reſt Laymen. And therefore there is no reaſon, any reflection ſhould be caſt upon the Aſſembly upon that account. But let us come to the acts of this Aſſembly.

After a great deal of pains and ſtudy, ſays the Doctor, *they ſet forth a Catechiſm, for children at ſchool to learn.*† This is a miſtake. The *Larger Catechiſm* was deſign'd for the uſe of ſuch as were more advanc'd both in years and religion. 'Tis known by experience, that a catechetical way of inſtructing is above all others the moſt uſeful: whence it has been practis'd in all ages. The Aſſembly therefore, conſulting the edification of all ſorts of Chriſtians among us, not only drew up a *Shorter Catechiſm* for children, of which afterwards; but this which was more

* Elench. Controv. *p.* 90. † *Page* 57.

more full and large, for the use of others: wherein they had good precedents, both among Foreign Divines, and those at home of the Episcopal persuasion. And to say nothing of *Cyril*, and the primitive Christians; Archbishop *Usher*, a person of admirable judgment and piety, publish'd several Catechisms: one very short, of 34 Pages, in small *Duodecimo*; another of 52 Pages, bound up with the former; a third 451 Pages, in *Folio*. It would be endless to reckon up all the Episcopal Divines, who have publish'd their catechetical institutions, which have been larger than this Catechism of the Assembly. For, indeed, it contains but 81 Pages, in *Duodecimo*. Our Author's censure therefore of this work is very unjust, when he says: *But as the work went on, it had grown to such a bulk, that people* [he means some buffoons of his own party, who praise that in themselves which they ridicule in their neighbours] *could not chuse but smile at the oddness of the contrivance; that they should order those things should be committed to such tender memories, which the composers thereof had, for many years, been taking in writing from the Lectures of Scholastic Professors.* What hurt these *Professors* have done our Author I can't tell, but I find he has a lash for them, * as often as they come in his way. And what do's it signify of whom the Divines in the Assembly learnt the matters they taught, provided they were truths proper to be taught? But 'tis not hard to guess what is design'd by this suggestion, *viz.* That those poor souls of Divines had nothing to say, without looking first into the notes they had taken from others. And if that, as our Adversaries seem to think, is the general unhappiness of *Calvinists*, I can't see how the Assembly can be excus'd; since 'tis certain they were all such. They defended the hated doctrine of *Calvin*, against the Jesuits, and Bishop *Laud*'s faction: and this was a crime never to be forgiven. Judge whether it be not so by what next follows.

But the fault was yet less pardonable, in that the most perplext points of Divinity, concerning Predestination, the secret Will of God, &c. *should be therein propos'd to be discuss'd by School boys, with which the wits of the most learned Theologues, whenever they treat of them, are for the most part puzzled and confounded.* So that what the *Armi-*

S *nians*

* See p. 176.

nians practice daily with much praise and commendation, must in *Calvinists* be esteemed a great crime. And yet whatever the crime be, the Assembly might learn it from those of the Episcopal persuasion. Just in the same manner are these things handled in a Catechism set forth by K. *Edward* the Sixth's authority; and by another printed in the year 1607, which used to be bound up with our *Bibles*. Both which are printed by Mr. *Prynne*, in his *Antiarminianism*. Nay, and in the common Church Catechism boys are taught to believe, that *the Holy Ghost sanctifies all the* elect *people of God*.

Our Author thus goes on: *Therefore to rectify this mistake, the Synod injoins that this long Catechism should be abridg'd. But now these difficult points of Divinity being but lightly touch'd upon, they are render'd the more obscure.* This Catechism was indeed design'd for the use of children; but what greater obscurity there is in this, than the other, I can't imagine, and question very much whether any one can tell me. Altho I will not vindicate every expression in it, yet in the main I will venture to commend it, as the best and most orderly summary of religion I have met with, considering the bigness of it. Let the Foreign Divines compare it with the Catechism in the Book of Common Prayer: I am sure we need not fear their verdict. 'Tis translated into *Greek* and *Latin* by Mr. *Harmar*. And what reputation it gain'd among pious and learned men, we may guess by what Mr. *Hickman* says of two famous Divines: "When a copy of it was "sent to Mr. *Peter du Moulin*, he return'd this answer, "that he never saw a more perfect Catechism; nor did "Archbishop *Usher* less esteem it." *

I shall not need to say much of the *Directory*; *in which* our Author can discover nothing to find fault with, but that *all Forms of Prayer are banish'd, out of disregard to the English Common Prayer Book:* † which is a pretty strong presumption the Book is very compleat and useful in its kind.

After this, much time is spent in settling Church discipline, and in establishing the Parochial, Classical and National Assemblies. But in all this affair, their labour is but lost; for our English people, being impatient under lordship, do with

* Apol. *p.* 4. † *Page* 58.

with great reluctancy receive this discipline. That their labour was not quite lost, our Author immediately confesses, when he says: *This discipline the people of* London *receive at first with some readiness, those in several market towns not appearing very averse to it; but the country parishes do hardly any where receive it.* 'Twas the observation of Bishop *Parker* and Dr. *Goodman*, that the inhabitants of cities and market towns were more commonly addicted to our principles, than those who dwelt in country villages. And upon a diligent inquiry into the abstruse reasons of this difficult point, they at last concluded, this must be owing to the too great increase of trade in the nation. For while poor countrymen, who weary'd themselves with their hard daily labour, had little inclination to trouble themselves about the discipline and ceremonies of the Church; the inhabitants of cities and towns living at their ease, and having time upon their hands, indulg'd their curiosity. They therefore with all humility mov'd, that for the sake of their ceremonies, our Parliament would find out some speedy remedy against this evil, and lay some restraint (as they thought fit) upon trade. Such was the fondness our Adversaries then had for their ceremonies, that they would have gladly sold the most useful thing in the nation for them; tho they were dear at the price of one single halfpenny. Nor was this the only time, when they were prefer'd to trade, to the unspeakable prejudice of the nation.

Now tho there were at that time, as there are still, many of the inhabitants of villages, who were on our side; yet it cannot be deny'd that the number of these was less in proportion than of the other: of which various reasons might be given. Men of their imployment and conversation are not commonly very quick and ingenious; nor so apt throughly to consider and examine things foreign to their ordinary callings. Besides, the greatest profanation of the Lord's Day, during the tyranny of Archbishop *Laud*, was in these villages; where the people minded little else, on that day, but sporting and gaming. Hence as mens minds are more addicted to pleasure, than to virtue and piety; these country people did not much care to have this yoke put upon them. Nor can this seem strange to those who are vers'd in the histories of ancient times. Thus when under the encouragement of the first Christian Emperours, our religion

ſpread itſelf far and near in a very ſhort ſpace in cities; the inhabitants of the villages ſtood out the longeſt and moſt ſtifly in their ſuperſtition. Whence thoſe who embrac'd not the Chriſtian religion, are frequently by *Auguſtine*, and other Fathers, as they are with us to this day, term'd *Pagans*: the name being deriv'd from *pagus*, which ſignifies a *village*. The judgment therefore of ſuch *villagers* or *Pagans* cannot juſtly be interpreted to the prejudice of our cauſe, unleſs it be likewiſe to that of Chriſtianity itſelf. Taking our leave therefore of theſe *Pagans*, let us return to our Author.

This was the ſtate of religion at that time in England, *after the Church was overthrown: the Presbyterian Miniſters being promoted to the beſt preferments of the Church, the meaner livings fill'd by men who had been formerly bred to trades.* *

If the circumſtances of our Miniſters became now a little more comfortable, our Adverſaries have no reaſon to envy them, conſidering how long and grievouſly they had ſuffer'd before thro their inſtigation. And ſince the Epiſcopal Clergy ſo greedily hunt after the beſt preferments, I can't imagine, why our Author ſhould blame the Presbyterian Miniſters for accepting ſuch, now the obſtacles being remov'd, they could do it with a good conſcience: eſpecially ſince they behav'd themſelves well in thoſe preferments, being ſo diligent in feeding their flocks rather than themſelves, as that they appear'd well to deſerve the preferments, however good they were. True piety, I think, hardly ever flouriſh'd more in the latter ages than at that time. And yet I don't deny that ſome things were then out of order; which may well be imputed to the unſettled condition of the nation at that time, and eſpecially to the exorbitant power of *Cromwell*.

Hence ſome tradeſmen and Sectaries got into livings, which the Miniſters were troubled at, but could not hinder: however it having been the practice of the Church to admit ſuch in Queen *Elizabeth*'s reign, 'twill be prudent in our Adverſaries, not to aggravate this matter too much.

But the pulpits do not thunder now, as heretofore, againſt Pluraliſts; the Puritans at that time being pleas'd to favour

* Page 59.

vour themſelves, who being poſſeſs'd of three or four Benefices, which ſeveral of the Epiſcopal Divines had been ſequeſtred from, or depriv'd of, live in great eaſe and ſplendor. This is the firſt time I have heard the Puritans thus charg'd, and then I will believe the charge to be true, when I ſee it prov'd: *viz.* That the Presbyterian Miniſters (for I am not concern'd in the Sectaries) held at the ſame time more good livings than one, lying at ſuch a diſtance, as that they were not able themſelves conveniently to ſerve them. Every body knows the income of ſome livings in *England* is ſo ſmall, as not to be ſufficient to maintain a Miniſter: whence ſometimes one Miniſter ſerves two livings which lie near together: nor do I remember that any of the Puritan writers ever ſpake a word againſt this practice. But they always, and in my judgment deſervedly, eſteem'd it a great wickedneſs, for one Miniſter to have two or more fat livings; one perhaps in the North of *England*, another in the South, another in the Eaſt; the profits of all which he receiv'd, tho' he ſerv'd himſelf but one, putting off the reſt with ſome mean Curates, hir'd with ſorry ſtipends.

But in the mean time that theſe men fared ſo finely, the poor Epiſcoparians liv'd as hardly. For the ruſty Gowns which they were forc'd to wear, render'd them a jeſt to the Fanatic rabble: they being forc'd either to get their victuals at great mens tables, or to keep ſome poor little ſchool for their livelihood. Let any of our Adverſaries now ſuppoſe the Miniſters of that time to anſwer this objection, as *Whitgift* anſwer'd *Cartwright* in the like caſe: "What commodities you want, that we have, we can-"not conjecture: your meat and drink is provided with "leſs trouble and charges unto you, and in more delicate "and dainty manner, than ours is: your eaſe and plea-"ſure ten times more, you do what you liſt, go when "you liſt, come when you liſt, ſpeak when you liſt, at "your pleaſure. What would you have more? I know "not why you ſhould complain, except you be of the "ſame diſpoſition with the *Franciſcan* Friars, who when "they have fill'd their bellies at other mens tables, were "wont to cry out and ſay: *How many things are we "forc'd to endure?*" * Would not any man think ſuch an

* Defence, *p.* 283.

ſwer barbarous? I own I ſhould, and would not have again mention'd that paſſage; but that, by bringing it in apply'd to their own caſe, our Adverſaries may ſee how we have been dealt with. But as to the thing it ſelf; we can truly ſay, we are heartily ſorry that ſeveral learned and pious Miniſters were then turn'd out; tho they were not ſo many as is pretended by our Adverſaries, who have lately ſtretch'd their wits and conſciences to increaſe their number, and to make Saints of them: whereas a multitude of them (as I obſerv'd before) were turn'd out for the moſt flagrant wickedneſs depos'd upon oath againſt them, which, out of a regard to the honour of our country, and our Adverſaries themſelves, we chuſe not particularly to mention, unleſs they will force us to it. But the temper of the Parliament was, in one thing admirable: for they order'd the ejected Miniſters (whatever the cauſe of their ejectment was) ſhould receive a fifth part of their former income. If we conſider the ſucceeding times, we ſhall find the Epiſcopal Gentlemen to have acted with a very different temper. In the year 1662, upon the Reſtoration of King *Charles*, when the Presbyterians were turn'd out of their livings; the Epiſcopal party, deſtitute of all compaſſion, allow'd them not the leaſt farthing: nay, on the contrary, ſoon after, in the year 1665, they baniſh'd them from cities, market towns, and their own houſes; and then grievouſly harraſs'd, impriſon'd and plunder'd them. But they are the rather to be excus'd in uſing us ſo; ſince upon occaſion they ſcruple not to uſe one another in like manner. Thus when ſeveral Biſhops, and many of the Clergy, loſt their livings, becauſe they adher'd to the receiv'd doctrine of the Church, and refus'd to ſwear allegiance to K. *William* (which they could not honeſtly do, if there had beeen any truth in that doctrine) they had not the leaſt proviſion made for them by law.

And after it was obſerv'd, that they maintain'd themſelves and families by this painful employ, it was forbid by a new ſort of cruelty, that any of them for the future ſhould keep any ſchool. Now allow this for truth, and let it paſs for a *ſort of cruelty*. Yet how can it be call'd *a new ſort of cruelty*. Let any man but look into the Canons of the Church, and particularly thoſe of 1603, and he will find this *cruelty* as old as thoſe Canons. For 'tis there expreſly forbidden, that any man ſhould

ſhould teach ſchool without ſubſcribing. * And had it been a *new ſort of cruelty*, it would have been prudent to have paſs'd it over in ſilence, ſince the Epiſcopal party ſoon after practis'd it themſelves, as may be ſeen by the *Act of Uniformity* in 1662. Which yet had not cruelty enough in it to ſatisfy our Adverſaries, who therefore endeavour'd to advance conſiderably farther in the *Schiſm Act*, in the year 1714; which came in force on the ever memorable *Firſt* of *Auguſt*.

In the next place our Author treats of the *beheading* K. *Charles*; which being a matter known to every one, I need ſay nothing of it. But ſince he repreſents the Puritans, as repenting of what they had done, after he was dead, I ſhall vindicate them from his calumnies. MDCXLVIII.

The Puritans now being awaken'd by this horrid act, ſeem to repent of what they had done. Whether they were more griev'd for the miſeries which they had brought upon their country; or for the loſs of their power, which was now got out of their hands, into thoſe of the Sectaries; is a matter not very eaſy to be determin'd. If we will believe Mr. Milton, *who ſeems to have had as certain a knowledge of thoſe times as any one, he tells us, this fit of love to the King was only out of hatred to the Independents.* †

'Tis an *eaſy matter* enough *to determine* who were the cauſes of thoſe tumults and confuſions. 'Tis an *eaſy matter* enough for any, but our Adverſaries (who pretend to ſearch our hearts and know all things) *to determine* for what *the Puritans* were then *griev'd*. The caſe was really thus: When *Cromwell* and his party were contriving to put the King to death, they impriſon'd ſeveral Members, who were moſt likely to oppoſe them, others they excluded the Parliament Houſe: whereupon many others for fear forſook it. The Parliament being thus modell'd according to *Cromwell*'s deſire, King *Charles* was without any great difficulty found guilty. As ſoon as the Miniſters of *London* ſaw this, they put forth a printed Declaration, ſign'd by 58 of them, wherein they thus teſtify their judgment: "As for the preſent actings at "*Weſtminſter*, ſince the time that ſo many of the Mem- "bers were by force ſecluded, divers impriſon'd, and "others

* Can. 77. † Pag. 62.

" others thereupon withdrew from the Houſe of Com-
" mons (and there not being that conjunction of
" the two Houſes as heretofore) we are wholly unſatis-
" fy'd therein; becauſe we conceive them to be ſo
" far from being warranted by ſufficient authority, as
" that in our apprehenſions they tend to an actual alte-
" ration (if not ſubverſion) of that which the Honoura-
" ble Houſe of Commons, in their *Declaration* of *April*
" 17, 1646, have taught us to call, *The fundamental con-*
" *ſtitution, and government of this kingdom*, which they
" therein aſſure us (if we underſtand them) they would
" never alter. "

" Yea, we hold our ſelves bound in duty to God, re-
" ligion, the King, Parliament and kingdom, to profeſs
" before God, Angels and men, that we verily believe
" that which is ſo much fear'd to be now in agitation,
" *the taking away the life of the King*, in the preſent
" way of trial, is not only not agreeable to any Word
" of God, the principles of the Proteſtant religion (ne-
" ver yet ſtain'd with the leaſt drop of blood of a King)
" or the fundamental conſtitution and government of
" this kingdom; but contrary to them, as alſo to the
" *Oath of allegiance*, the *Proteſtation* of *May* 5. 1641. and
" the *ſolemn League and Covenant.* " Whereupon they earneſtly exhort all to beware of perjury, and " to pray
" that God would reſtrain the violence of men, that they
" may not dare to draw upon themſelves and the king-
" dom the blood of their Soveraign. "

And now ſince the Miniſters declar'd their judgments, by this public act, in the very critical time, and to the great hazard of their lives, to what purpoſe is it to appeal to Mr. *Milton?* Or what will his teſtimony ſignify with wiſe men? Mr. *Milton*, pretending to ſearch the hearts of the Presbyterian Miniſters, has here moſt unjuſtly, and only upon conjectures condemn'd them, whom he continually treats as adverſaries. If Mr. *Milton ſeems to have had as certain a knowledge of thoſe times as any one*; I hope he had no certain knowledge of the ſecrets of the hearts of the Puritans. Had the Epiſcopal Miniſters dar'd to have publiſh'd ſuch a Declaration at *London*, being in the midſt of their enemies, and lying at their mercy, how would their fidelity and bravery have been extoll'd to the skies by their own party? But 'tis their common practice to put a perverſe and malicious conſtruction

ſtruction upon ſuch actions in us, as they would extravagantly applaud in themſelves. Further, by the place our Author cites from Mr. *Milton* 'tis evident, that Declaration was publiſh'd before the King was beheaded. But there is no need to tranſcribe his words, ſince the thing is certain, from what I have already ſaid. So that 'tis really baſe to repreſent them as not *awaken'd*, 'till after that *horrid act*: when 'tis ſo evident they remonſtrated againſt it, before it was committed. And if Mr. *Milton*, as they ſeem to allow, when it will ſerve their purpoſe of calumniating their adverſaries, had ſuch *a certain knowledge of thoſe times*; and they eſteem him a ſufficient witneſs againſt his adverſaries, not barely when he ſpeaks upon conjectures, but when he relates matters of fact; I am ſure they muſt be ſenſible they often draw K. *Charles* in very falſe colours. Let any man read the 4 and 12 Chapters of his firſt *Defence*, and he will be ſatisfy'd of the truth of what I ſay. If then they will allow him to be a falſe witneſs, when he ſpeaks of King *Charles*; why ſhould they not own the ſame thing, when he ſpeaks of our Miniſters? Our Author next makes a long complaint of the ſeveral Hereſies, which ſprung up during the *Interregnum*. This cannot with any juſtice be attributed to the Presbyterians. 'Tis what has frequently happen'd, when the Church's circumſtances, have been favourable and proſperous. Their moſt ſubtil enemy, the Devil, is then buſieſt in ſowing his tares, when he ſees God's good ſeed ſown in greateſt abundance. 'Tis owing to his wicked policy, that the credit of religion (as often as it began to flouriſh) has been weaken'd by the Hereſies which have ſprung up, and the tumults which have been rais'd. The ſouls of good and pious men are hereby diſquieted and tormented: others, who were ready to embrace Chriſtianity, are made more doubtful and wavering, and become at length utterly prejudic'd againſt it. Who does not know, that the greateſt miſchief befel the Chriſtian religion, when it firſt appear'd in the world, by the numberleſs Hereſies which then were ſtarted? Great tumults, and a variety of religious contentions attended the converſion of the Roman Emperours to the Chriſtian Faith; of which the Pagans made great complaints.

[?] *Page* 63, &c.

plaints. In like manner the Papiſts blame the Reformation for the tumults of the Anabaptiſts at *Munſter*, and the ſeveral Hereſies which have riſen ſince *Luther*. And in imitation of ſuch examples, our Adverſaries would impute to us the cauſe of thoſe Hereſies, of which we have always declar'd the utmoſt abhorrence. There is indeed little reaſon to wonder, ſo many Hereſies ſhould then ſpring up; if we conſider it was during the time of the civil war, when ſoldiers, and ſuch like unskilful perſons, undertook to be the Preachers of religion. Nor were there wanting ſuch at that time, as endeavour'd craftily to foment religious diviſions and contentions in the nation. This was not done only by Popiſh emiſſaries, but by others who wrote, after their baſe copy. Thus Dr. *Jeremy Taylor*, who was afterward Biſhop of *Down* and *Conner*, at that time pleaded ſtrenuouſly the Anabaptiſts cauſe. What his deſign herein was, I had rather the reader ſhould learn from one of their own ſide, than from me. Thus then Mr. *W. Wall*, a learn'd writer, to whom the nation is much indebted, for the pains he has taken in his *Hiſtory of Infant Baptiſm*, repreſents Biſhop *Taylor*'s deſign: "'Tis generally ſuppos'd "that he did this with a politic intention (commonly "practis'd by thoſe of the Church of *Rome*) to divide "the Adverſaries of the Church of *England* among "themſelves; and to that end put arguments into the "mouth of one ſect, in order to puzzle the other. A ſort "of prevaricating in the things of God, which few Pro-"teſtants or ſincere Chriſtians will account juſtifiable "upon any account whatever." *

And tho much miſchief was done to religion by thoſe Hereſies; yet that true piety was much increas'd in thoſe times cannot with any modeſty be deny'd. And unleſs religion had then taken deep root in mens hearts, what occaſion would there have been to uſe ſo much art and induſtry to corrupt mens manners after the Reſtauration? Farther, if the Heretical opinions, then ſcatter'd among the common people, muſt be charg'd upon the Presbyterians; upon whom ſhall we charge the not leſs Heretical and pernicious opinions, which have abounded in the nation, ever ſince the Church of *England's golden days*

* Hiſt. *p.* 271.

days have appear'd? If a true account was taken, the number of Heretics would not perhaps prove leſs now, than it was then in thoſe confus'd times. However 'tis notorious all manner of wickedneſs (the worſt Hereſy) which was much diſcourag'd and ſuppreſs'd in the *Interregnum*, came in like a flood together with the Hierarchy.

I have prov'd the Presbyterians oppos'd the cutting off K. *Charles* I. I will now ſhew they were not leſs true and faithful to his Son when he was gone. For when *Cromwell* requir'd all to abjure monarchy, and to ſwear to be true to his new commonwealth; many of them refus'd it, and exhorted their countrymen not to do it; altho many of the epiſcopal ſort not only ſwore themſelves, but wrote arguments in defence of the preſcrib'd oath; as is atteſted by Mr. *Baxter*. * With their plauſible and ſubtile gloſſes they varniſh'd over what they diſapprov'd. Then was invented the nice diſtinction of *De facto* and *De jure*, not to be met with among all the ſubtilties of the Schoolmen; and by the help of it, they diſpens'd with their taking *the Engagement, and promiſing to be true and faithful to the commonwealth, as 'tis now eſtabliſh'd, without a King or Houſe of Lords.* According to this diſtinction many of the ſame kidney ſwore to King *William*, as a King *de facto*, but not *de jure*, as they are not aſham'd now to own: ſo well have they learnt the Jeſuitical doctrine of equivocation, and to make a jeſt of an oath, one of the moſt ſacred things in the world.

After this the *Scots* Presbyterians call'd in the King, and crown'd him, when he had taken *the ſolemn League and Covenant*, and made an acknowledgment of his Father's ſins. Upon this *Cromwell* invaded them. The *Engliſh* Presbyterian Miniſters then had a meeting, wherein they conſulted how they might beſt raiſe Money for his Majeſty's uſe; but their deſign taking air, they were in great danger. Two of them fled abroad; eight were ſent to the *Tower*; among theſe was Mr. *Chriſtopher Love*, a man of excellent piety; who was condemn'd for it, and died with great courage and magnanimity. Mr. *Gibbons*, an honeſt Gentleman, was beheaded with him for the ſame cauſe.

After

* Baxt. Life, *Part* 1. *p.* 65.

After *Cromwell's* death, the nation was miserably distracted and unsettled; and then the Presbyterians made another vigorous attempt to restore the King. Sir *George Booth*, and Sir *Thomas Middleton* rais'd an army in *Cheshire*. But, the *Cavaliers* not assisting them, they were soon routed by *Lambert*. Afterwards General *Monk* march'd his army out of *Scotland* into *England*, declaring himself to be against monarchy, and for a free commonwealth. But after he came to *London*, upon the urgent persuasions of the Presbyterian Ministers, he alter'd his mind MDCLX. and declar'd for the King. The old Rump Parliament being dissolv'd, a new one was call'd; who presently appointed a day of fasting and prayer for themselves. The House of Commons chose Mr. *Calamy*, Dr. *Gauden*, and Mr. *Baxter* to preach to them. They all earnestly exhorted them in their Sermons to restore his Majesty. The next day being the 1st of *May*, the Parliament voted the King home again, without the least opposition.

Certain Divines, and others, were then sent by the Parliament and City to him into *Holland*. The King knowing of their coming, and being satisfy'd the only hope he could have of recovering his dominions lay in them, craftily contriv'd how he might delude them and secure their favour. He therefore so order'd it, that the Ministers, when they first came, should be put into a room, where they might hear his Majesty (retir'd in the next room, and as not acquainted with their arrival) earnestly praying to God, and professing before him his sincerity in the Protestant religion, and his honest resolutions of advancing it. These plain hearted Ministers, who understood nothing of intrigue, were transported immediately with the prospect they had of the happy times they should see under the reign of so very religious and godly a Prince. After this he publish'd a Declaration from *Breda*, Apr. 4, wherein are these words: "We do declare a liberty to tender consciences, and "that no man shall be disquieted, or call'd in question "for differences of opinion, which do not disturb the "peace of the kingdom; and that we shall be ready to "consent to such an Act of Parliament, as upon mature "deliberation shall be offer'd to us, for the full granting "that indulgence." The Royalists also then were very liberal in their promises, tho they never peform'd the least

leaſt tittle of them. " Dr. *Bates* takes notice that the " Act of Uniformity was paſs'd after the King had in- " gag'd his faith, and honour, in his Declaration from " *Breda, to preſerve the liberty of conſcience inviolate*; " which promiſe open'd the way for his Reſtoration; and " after the Royaliſts here had given public aſſurance, " that all former animoſities ſhould be buried, *as rubbiſh*, " *under the foundation of an univerſal concord.*"*

Few now doubt whether King *Charles* was a Papiſt at his Reſtoration. But he then thought his intereſt and authority not enough eſtabliſh'd for him to attempt the cruſhing the Presbyterians; and therefore he ſeems at firſt to have ſeriouſly attempted the compoſing our differences; as likewiſe appears by his *Declaration* of 25 *Octob.* 1660; and by what my Lord Chancellor *Hyde* ſaid in a Speech to the Parliament ſome time before.

But ſoon after, when he found the Epiſcopal party were ſo incens'd, as that they would rather run any hazards, than yield and thing at all to the complaints and requeſts of the Presbyterians; he ſeems to have thought he might be able to ſink them, and ſo he alter'd his deſign, and in favour of the Papiſts, did all he could to increaſe and perpetuate our quarrels. The King in the *Declaration* laſt mention'd, promis'd many things to the Miniſters; who very hartily thank'd him for them in an Addreſs they preſented. But when they look'd that the matter of the Declaration ſhould be turn'd into a law, they found themſelves ſadly diſappointed. All the Courtiers earneſtly oppos'd it; and none doubted they did ſo by the King's direction. From that time affairs took a quite contrary turn; and the Presbyterians were well rewarded by the King and the Royaliſts for reſtoring them; according as Mr. *Milton* had truly forewarn'd them. " Wo be to you Presbyterians eſpecially, *ſays he*, " if ever any of King *Charles*'s race recovers the *Engliſh* " ſceptre. Believe me, you ſhall pay all the reckon- " ing, *&c.*" But let us now return to our Author.

The divine favour once more began to ſhine out bright upon the Church of England, *and the former ſtorms being diſpers'd, her golden days again appear.*† None will wonder that the time our Adverſaries MDCLXII.

* Funer. Serm. for Mr. Baxt. † *Pag.* 72.

faries reckon their *golden age*, is eſteem'd by us to have been an *iron* one. I am ſure if a deſcription was to be given of that time in the words of the old *Roman* poet, nothing would better ſuit it, than what he ſays of the *iron age*.

Strait with a ſudden and reſiſtleſs rage
A flood of vice o'erwhelms the coming age:
Truth's baniſh'd from the vile degenerate race,
While heav'nly faith deſerts th' unhappy place,
And modeſt virtue hides her hated face.
Inſtead of thoſe th' infernal lake ſupplies
Infernal frauds, and fills the land with lies:
Rapine and endleſs avarice ſucceeds,
And vanquiſh'd by her foes ſincere religion bleeds.

The depriv'd Biſhops are drawn from their priſons and retirements: I would fain know what priſons the Reſtoration found them in; unleſs they muſt be judg'd impriſon'd, when they are reſtrain'd from perſecuting their innocent neighbours. *and the ejected Miniſters are reſtor'd to their flocks:* And a great many Miniſters are ejected, and driven from their flocks. *the Churches are adorn'd with their former ornaments:* That is, Altars, Croſſes, Pictures of God in the ſhape of an old man, &c. *and the eccleſiaſtical revenues were given up, which had lately been ſacrilegiouſly poſſeſs'd by private hands.* If men are to be counted *ſacrilegious* for buying or detaining ſuch poſſeſſions, as once belong'd to the Church, a great many of our Adverſaries, as is well known, are at this day ſacrilegious.

As for the Puritan Miniſters, who had unjuſtly invaded the livings of the Epiſcopalians, and thoſe who had by their writings, ſermons and perſuaſions, promoted the unnatural rebellion; even thoſe had not only no puniſhment laid upon them, but for nigh two years after the King's return they were ſuffer'd to enjoy the uſurped Benefices. That the Puritan Miniſters came not into the Churches, according to the uſage and cuſtom of the Church of *England*, is very true; and not much to be wonder'd at, conſidering their uſage was laid aſide; and unleſs they came in ſome other way, the people muſt have been without Miniſters. And it would have been ſimple in the Puritans to have refus'd the livings for fear of breaking the Church's goodly Canons.

Canons. But that *they had unjuſtly invaded the livings of the Epiſcoparians*, as the turn is invidiouſly given in the Tranſlation, is more eaſily aſſerted than prov'd. Were not thoſe conditions unjuſt, which excluded them from livings before the civil war? And where was the injuſtice of their excepting livings, when ſuch conditions were aboliſh'd? What *Puritan*, that is Presbyterian, *Miniſters* he means, *that had promoted the unnatural rebellion*, I knew not. I believe none of them went farther than the Parliament, as long as it continu'd free. And what was done by them I look upon to be a neceſſary defence, and not an *unnatural rebellion*. Further, tho the act of Parliament allow'd the Miniſters to keep their livings near two years; yet the Churchmen were in ſeveral places ſo very officious as to get the ſtart of the law in perſecuting them, and getting them turn'd out. Beſides, they were turn'd out of all thoſe livings, from which any of the Epiſcoparians had been ejected, if the Miniſters ejected were then alive; and that, whatever had been the reaſon or cauſe of their ejectment.

While theſe Matters were tranſacting by the ſtate, the Eccleſiaſtics of the Church of England *were contriving methods how the differences between the Puritans and us might be compromis'd; and all the points in controverſy between us might be friendly diſputed in a conference.* What the aim of the Eccleſiaſtics was, will eaſily appear. For our Author is not very conſiſtent with himſelf in his account of theſe things. A little farther in his Book he ſpeaks thus: *Nor indeed after the affairs of the ſtate were ſettled, was it in the power of the Biſhops to do any thing, but under the direction of the Court. For there all endeavours for accommodation were held for fanatical. From what fountain theſe maxims were deriv'd, we did but too late come to the knowledge of.** This is honeſtly ſaid, and as becomes a man of candor and ingenuity; ſaving that many of the Biſhops wanted a willingneſs as much as *a power to do any thing*. But how were *theſe Eccleſiaſtics contriving* an accommodation, when from a ſimple fear of being counted *fanatical*, they would not uſe endeavours for it? If they really endeavour'd after peace, as I ſhall prove they did not, this excuſe would be needleſs in their behalf:

* P. 77.

half: but if they need to have such an apology made for them, 'tis a plain evidence they did not contrive how to end our differences in any such way. Nay, so far were they from it, that on the contrary, they contriv'd how they might offend our side, and lay stumbling blocks in our way, that so they might widen and perpetuate the breach. Upon which account they not only refus'd to make easy alterations in our favour, but purposely alter'd some things to make them worse.

Therefore by virtue of a commission procur'd from the crown, a Conference is appointed to be held at London, *in the* Savoy.

Our Author here intimates, that this Conference was procur'd at the desire of the Bishops: which is a mistake. It was promis'd in the Declaration I mention'd before. But when his Majesty apprehended he could gain his ends, notwithstanding our differences continued; he appointed indeed the Conference to put the better colour upon his own proceedings, and not with any design of healing our breaches. Dr. *Gilbert Sheldon*, the Bishop of *London*, and afterwards Archbishop of *Canterbury*, was the chief director on the Episcopal side; and, being well acquainted with the designs of the Court, order'd the Conference according to their hearts desire. The Ministers therefore presently, upon their first meeting, could easily guess, from what he said, the issue of the Conference. When they were met, Archbishop *Frewen*, of *York*, spake first and said, he knew nothing of the business; but perhaps the Bishop of *London* knew more of the King's mind in it, and therefore was fitter to speak in it than he. The Bishop of *London* then told them, that the Conference had been sought by the Ministers and not by the Bishops: that the Ministers had desir'd alterations in the Liturgy, and therefore they [the Bishops] had nothing to say or do, till the Ministers brought in all they had to say against it in writing, and all the additional forms and alterations which they desir'd. By this proposal he doubtless design'd to delay business, and waste time: he foresaw that disputes would arise, and when manag'd this tedious way would soon run out the four months space allow'd for the Conference, without doing any great matter in it. The Ministers earnestly oppos'd this motion, and urg'd the King's commission, which requir'd them *to meet together, advise and consult.* They said,

ſaid, by conference they might perceive, as they went along, what each would yield to, and might more ſpeedily diſpatch, and more probably attain their end: whereas writing would be a tedious, endleſs buſineſs, and they ſhould not have that familiarity and acquaintance with each others minds, which might facilitate their concord. But the Biſhop of *London* reſolutely inſiſted on it, not to do any thing, till they brought in all their exceptions, alterations and additions at once. He ſuppos'd the Miniſters would never agree upon theſe things among themſelves. The Miniſters were forc'd to yield, and brought in their exceptions, *&c.* But Dr. *Nichols* ſeems offended, they ſhould *find fault with innumerable particulars in the worſhip and diſcipline of the Church.* * But if the things were themſelves faulty, they are not to be blam'd for what they did. And the Biſhops might have made an advantage of this, to correct their admir'd book, and have form'd it to the greateſt perfection.

Dr. *Nichols* is angry with Mr. *Baxter*, *who*, ſays he, *had ſo mean an opinion of our Liturgy (which all Foreign Divines are wont to eſteem of) that he did not think it capable of amendment; but ventur'd to compoſe a new one, entirely of his own head without retention of the primitive forms, and in a method different from any antient Liturgy.* The Foreigners eſteem of the *Engliſh* Liturgy is greater in our Adverſaries imagination, than in reality; and let them pleaſe themſelves with it. As to what he ſays of Mr. *Baxter*, the caſe in ſhort was thus: The very form of the Engliſh Liturgy was diſlik'd by the Miniſters, and they thought it much eaſier to draw up a new one, than to mend the old one. They therefore allotted this task to Mr. *Baxter*, who judg'd that the beſt way to obtain peace, was to draw up ſuch a Liturgy, as would pleaſe all, who were not abſolutely againſt forms of prayer in publick worſhip. The readieſt way to this, was to leave out every thing controverted and doubtful, and to expreſs the forms in the very words of Holy Scripture. Mr. *Baxter*, being well vers'd therein, ſoon perform'd his task, diſpoſing every thing into a very neat and handſom method. Our Adverſaries complain, this was done in *a method different from any antient Liturgy.* But if they

* Pag. 75.

have no better teſtimonies, than what are produc'd afterwards out of antiquity for Liturgies, they had much better let that matter alone; for more impertinent and trifling ones cannot be collected about any thing. This Liturgy Mr. *Baxter* ſubmitted to the Biſhops correction and alterations. *But*, ſays the Doctor, *this, ſo mean a performance in reſpect of the eſtabliſh'd Liturgy, and undertaken with ſo great a preſumption, the Epiſcoparians do unanimouſly with contempt throw aſide.* * No man, unleſs he is greatly prejudic'd, will ſay the *performance is mean.* Nor can it be juſtly ſaid to be *undertaken with a great preſumption*; ſince, the Biſhops refus'd a friendly and free conference, and requir'd them to deliver in all they deſir'd at once. But they may be excus'd in their contemning Mr. *Baxter*'s Liturgy, ſince they treat all the foreign Liturgies in the ſame manner. Sure 'tis a great inſtance of *preſumption* and haughtineſs, that men cannot bear to have any Liturgy commended but their own; and deſpiſe and ſlight all others, whether of foreigners, or their own countrymen. And Mr. *Baxter* makes it plain, they deſpis'd that Liturgy without knowing what it was; † and 'tis very eaſy to deſpiſe the beſt things in the world after that rate. The Miniſters, together with their Liturgy, and their exceptions againſt the eſtabliſh'd Liturgy, preſented a Petition to the Biſhops; wherein they earneſtly ſued to them for peace. And in a word, they ſeem to have left nothing untried, which they thought would contribute toward the obtaining it. But all was in vain; for they who were let into the ſecret of the Court, reſolv'd to ſteer quite another courſe.

That this Conference had no better ſucceſs Mr. Baxter, *in his Life, wrote by himſelf, lays all the blame upon the managers of the Church ſide.* And very juſtly, without all doubt; ſince they would not make the leaſt conceſſion to the Miniſters. Nor is it any wonder they did not, ſince they ſo tamely fell in with all the meaſures of the Court, as our Author preſently acknowledges. If the Epiſcopal party had then as ſtoutly oppos'd the Popiſh deſigns of the Court, as the Presbyterians did, this Conference would have been attended with very good ſucceſs.

Our

* *Pag.* 76. † Life, *Part* 2. *P.* 335.

Our Author is to be commended for his candour in acknowledging, that Biſhop *Morley, and Dr.* Gunning *drop'd ſome expreſſions, that were more hot than were becoming Divines.** As to Biſhop *Nicholſon*, whom Mr. *Baxter* commends, he was no Commiſſioner, and ſo with whatever temper he ſpake, it ſignifies little to our purpoſe, Biſhop *Gauden* ſeems not to have been in the ſecret, and to have been a Man who had but little intereſt in his Collegues. Dr. *Pearſon*, as I have been inform'd, uſed to lay the blame of the ill Succeſs of that Conference upon Biſhop *Gunning*. And now our Author comes to excuſe thoſe of his own ſide.

Nor indeed after the affairs of ſtate were ſettled, was it in the power of the Biſhops to do any thing, but under the direction of the Court. And why was it not as much in their power, as in the Presbyterians? Or what greater danger would the Biſhops have incur'd thereby, than did the Presbyterians? Our Brethren abroad may hence learn, how eaſy and flexible our adverſaries can be upon occaſion. However rugged they have ſhewn themſelves toward the Diſſenters; yet they can be as tame and pliable as may be to a Court, when they have any ends to ſerve by it. But now let us hear why the Biſhops could do nothing:

For there [in the Court] *all endeavours for accomodation, were held for fanatical.* And what then? Does the divine command of *following peace with all men* † ceaſe, whenever the Court is pleas'd to deſpiſe it? Surely the Apoſtle was not of this mind, who was not much mov'd at *Feſtus* his counting *him mad*; ‖ nor neglected any divine command, that he might gape after the favour of Courtiers. But the Biſhops, unaccountably ſcar'd with an odd fear of being eſteem'd fanatical, yield themſelves to the direction and counſels of ſuch as were carrying on Popiſh deſigns.

But our Author adds: *From what fountain theſe maxims were deriv'd, we did but too late come to the knowledge of.* We are glad our Adverſaries did at length come to the knowledge of it. But I ſhall not eaſily believe, that ſeveral of the Commiſſioners, who were acquainted with the King's intentions, did not at that time know whence

* *Pag.* 77. † Hebr. xii. 14 ‖ Acts xxvi. 24.

these things were deriv'd. The despis'd Presbyterians were not so stupid, as not plainly to perceive at what King *Charles* was driving.

We may add further, that if the Bishops committed any fault in the point of moderation, ['Tis pity any doubt should be made of it] *and did not make those concessions they might have done; they are the more to be pardon'd, by how much their minds, which were irritated by the many injuries which they sustain'd from the opposite party, were not yet sufficiently cool'd.* I cannot here but take notice of what our Author says of this matter, when he seems to be himself in a cooler temper toward us. "Indeed, had matters been ma- "nag'd with *tolerable temper*, there might have been some "good effect of this Commission, and an expedient have "been found out to have given the Presbyterian Ministers "some little satisfaction, so that they might have comply'd "with reputation among their party; whereby the sepa- "ration, which has since ensued, might have been hin- "der'd. But the Bishops being provok'd by their long "sufferings, and not brooking to have laws prescrib'd to "them by those who had been the occasion thereof; were "not very forward to make any alterations which were "propos'd by the Presbyterians, even in some things as "might have deserved consideration; refusing them so "much as the change of *deadly sin* into *heinous sin.*" * But whatever the Bishops had suffer'd, they should remember their Brethren had suffer'd first, and more at their hands; and that should have soften'd their resentments. But since our Author frankly blames them for being then out of temper; I wish we were worthy to know how long time will serve to cool them, and bring them into temper again. I dont see the Clergy are now any nearer to an healing temper then they were then; and they, as well as the Bishops, are by our Author elsewhere made to bear a part of the blame. "By the management of some great "persons, then in power, the minds of the Episcopal "Clergy and zealous Conformists were so wrought up, up- "on the talk of these alterations, that the Bishops, who "were concern'd in them, found it a difficult mat- "ter to manage the temper of their own friends." † So that the same temper continuing, and being much increas'd,

* *Pref. to his* Comment on the Book of Common Prayer. † *Notes on the Pref.*

creas'd, tho now no provocation can be pretended, I can't see but the same men must bear the blame of the continuance of our differences, who were unquestionably the first causes of them. But let us proceed with our Author.

However, it could not but move any ones spleen to see Mr. Baxter, *who had the principal share in this Conference, with so excessive a heat disturbing all calm and moderate propo-sals, and by taunt expressions, and frivolous objections against our constitution, giving new provocations to the Episcopal Divines.* I wish some instances had been alledg'd of this; for I can't find them in the account given of the Conference. Nay, 'tis plain our Adversaries *spleen was mov'd*, not by Mr. *Baxter's excessive heat*, but by the too great strength of his reasonings; upon which account they endeavour'd by their forgeries to lessen his credit. So Dr. *Pierce*, who was one of the Commissioners, afterwards publish'd malicious stories of his killing a man in cold blood, *&c.* which Mr. *Baxter* easily confuted. But let any man judge, who were likely to have any ends to serve, by *disturbing all calm and moderate proposals*; and then he will see, 'tis but reasonable to attribute that disturbance to some of the other side.

Neither could those reverend persons, many of which mov'd in the highest sphere in the Church, brook to have the Articles which the Presbyterians insisted on, not so much desir'd, as exacted and commanded: * This is an unreasonable cavil. For besides that the Commissioners had all equal authority with respect to the Conference, the Ministers out of their vehement desire of peace presented a most humble Petition to them. *And that by persons not only inferior to them in dignity, but in learning likewise:* This it is for men to be the slaves of a party. They must judge of the proposals made to them, according as they are affected to the persons who make them, and not according to the intrinsic excellence and goodness of them. Tho' to say the Truth, I don't see what the Bishops could despise in the Commissioners of the Presbyterian side. That they were inferior to them in dignity, is indeed true; but upon inquiry, the reason will appear to be this, that the one

* Pag. 78.

had courted that honour, which some of the others (particularly Mr. *Baxter* and Mr. *Calamy*) had refus'd, when offer'd them. Had they accepted it, they had without doubt been equal to the Commissioners on the other side, not only in *dignity*, but in *learning*. *Who had in a manner devoted themselves, and sworn to destroy the constitution of the Church of* England: In what sense they swore to the *Covenant* I have already observ'd. But what next follows I do not believe: *who in their sermons had excited the governing powers, which were of themselves severe enough, against them:* On the contrary, Mr. *Baxter* oppos'd the ejectment of the Episcopal Ministers, as Bishop *Walton* of *Chester* acknowledg'd in the open Conference. *And for fifteen years together had been enriching themselves out of their preferments, whilst the rightful owners thereof had been starving.* 'Twere easy to retort this charge from the preceeding times, wherein the poor Ministers had been starving for many times fifteen years; but I only observe, that the Bishops, being led by anger and revenge, prevented the accommodating our differences.

Not long after a Convocation is call'd. Mr. MDCLXI. *Pierce*, an Episcopal Minister, and a man of good temper, says: "Great pains and care were used "to frame this Convocation to the mind of the High "Prelatical party; keeping some out, and getting others "in, by very undue proceedings." * Further the Convocation was not chosen immediately upon the King's coming in, least the inferior Clergy should have been against the High party. But when many were turn'd out, that the old sequestred Ministers might come in; and the opinion of Reordination being set on foot, all those Ministers, who had been ordain'd, since the laying aside the Bishops, were deny'd their votes for members of the Convocation, they wholly carry'd their cause. So that it was properly enough a High Church Convocation. What their regard was to peace, may appear by this, that they would not so much as suffer the omission of reading the *Apocryphal* Lessons; nay, they made an addition to them, and upon their grave and learned consultation, prescrib'd the reading the sorry fable of *Bell and the Dragon*, which used not to be read before: which whether it was done with a design of edify-

* Conf. Plea for the Nonconform. *Part* 1. *p.* 37.

edifying the people, or of exasperating those who had testify'd their dislike of such Lessons, they knew best themselves. And when Dr. *Allen* of *Huntingtonshire*, a Clerk in this Convocation, earnestly labour'd with Bishop *Sheldon*, that they might so reform the Liturgy, as that no sober man might make exception, he was wish'd to forbear; for that what should be, was concluded on, or resolv'd. * The same Bishop is reported to have said: *Now we know their* [the Ministers] *minds, we will make them all knaves if they conform.* And at another time, when the Earl of *Manchester* told the King, while the *Act* of *Uniformity* was under debate, that he was afraid the terms of it were so rigid, that many of the Ministers would not comply with it: He reply'd, *I am afraid they will.*

The Dr. tells us: *The Liturgy being revis'd* [by the Convocation,] *the Parliament establish it by an Act, obliging all the Clergy who should enjoy any Benefice in the Church of* England, *to declare their consent to the use of it.* † And this they were oblig'd to do before *Bartholomew day, Aug.* 24. And yet it was but a very few days before that time, that the Book was publish'd. So that many of our Ministers complain'd, they were turn'd out, for not subscribing to a Book they had neither seen, nor could see in the limited time. A writer of one of the State Tracts says: "Not one man in forty could have seen and read "the Book, they did so perfectly assent and consent un-"to." ‡ I know how this will be defended: *It was a matter expressly and solemnly establish'd by law.* ‖ But if the truth was always to be told, he should rather say, the Clergy made most conscience of losing their livings. Our Author says: *A great number of Presbyterian Ministers partly out of shame, and not enduring to make a recantation of their errour; and partly out of scruple of conscience to take a counter oath, suffer themselves to be depriv'd of their livings, according to the tenour of the Act, on the* 24 *of* August, 1662. But I don't see what shame could be left in men who, would *declare their unfeigned assent and consent to all and every thing contain'd and prescrib'd in* a Book, they had not yet seen. Such men could not be troubled much with *scruples of conscience.* And in like manner they shew'd themselves men of wonderful easy consciences, that

* *Ibid. p.* 31. †-*Pag.* 80. ‡ State Tracts, *Vol.* I. *p.* 41. ‖ *See p.* 233.

they could ſubſcribe another Declaration mention'd in the Act of Uniformity, which they were forc'd themſelves afterwards to break thro. Which was a more remarkable inſtance of divine juſtice in expoſing their treachery, than what our Author mentions, which only ſerv'd to illuſtrate the integrity of honeſt men, who *fear'd an oath.* When the time came, about 2000 Miniſters choſe to part with their livings, rather than injure their conſciences. Nor do I believe, that any where in hiſtory an equal number of Clergymen, voluntarily leaving their all, for a good conſcience, can be produc'd. And thus *Bartholomew Day*, famous before for the horrid Maſſacre of the Martyrs in *France*, was now made ſo by the ſufferings of the *Engliſh* Confeſſors.

But 'tis worth while to ſhew here the baſe arts, whereby our Adverſaries procur'd that inhuman Act to be paſs'd in Parliament. I ſhall give an account of this matter from " Captain *Yarrington*, a man of an eſtabliſh'd " reputation, who in 1681. publiſh'd a full diſcovery of " the firſt Presbyterian ſham plot. In which diſcovery " he declares he related nothing, but what he could prove " by letters, and many living witneſſes. Nor was his ac- " count ever publicly contradicted, He ſays: That many " both of the Clergy and Laity, diſliking the King's De- " claration concerning eccleſiaſtical affairs, reſolv'd to run " things to the utmoſt height, and that ſome of the " leading Churchmen were heard to ſay: *They would* " *have an Act ſo fram'd, as would reach every Puritan* " *in the Kingdom: and that if they thought any of them* " *would ſo ſtretch their conſciences, as to be comprehended* " *by it, they would inſert yet other conditions and ſubſcri-* " *ptions, ſo as that they ſhould have no benefit by it,* To " pave the way for it, they contrive a Presbyterian plot, " which was laid in about 36 ſeveral counties. In *Wor-* " *ceſterſhire* ſeveral letters were drawn up, and diliver'd " by Sir *John P.* to one *Richard N.* his neighbour, to " convey them to *Cole* of *Martley*, who, with one *Churn*, " brought them back again to Sir *John P.* from whom " they came, making *Affidavit*, that *Cole* found the " packet, left by a *Scotch* pedlar under a hedge. In this " packet, when it was open'd, there were found ſeveral " letters, diſcovering a conſpiracy to raiſe a rebellion.

" There

" There were ſeveral letters to the Captain; one from " Mr. *Baxter* of *Kederminſter*, intimating, that he had " provided a conſiderable body of Men well arm'd, which " ſhould be ready againſt the time appointed; and ano- " ther from Mr. *Sparry*, intimating, he had order'd him " 500 *l.* lodg'd in a friend's hand, *&c.* Upon this, the " militia of the county was rais'd immediately, and the " city of *Worceſter* fill'd with them the very night after " the packet was open'd. The next morning the Cap- " tain was ſeiz'd by a Troop of Horſe, and brought " priſoner to *Worceſter*; and ſo alſo were Mr. *Sparry*, " Mr. *Oaſland*, Mr. *Moor* and Mr. *Brian*, Miniſters; to- " gether with ſome ſcores of others. They were all kept " cloſe priſoners for 10 days; by which time (the Trained " Bands being weary) moſt of them were diſcharg'd, " paying their fees. But the Captain, Mr. *Sparry*, and " the two *Oaſlands*, were ſtill kept cloſe priſoners in the " *George Inn*; the Dignitaries of the Cathedral taking " care when the Train'd Bands retir'd, to raiſe 60 Foot " Soldiers (who had double pay, and were call'd the " *Clergy Band*) to ſecure theſe criminals. And be- " ſides the Sentinels upon each priſoner, they had a Court " Guard at the Town Hall of *Worceſter*. There they per- " form'd one remarkable act of chivalry: A poor man " coming out of the country, to inquire after the wel- " fare of Mr. *Henry Oaſland* his Miniſter, and ſpeaking " to one of the Soldiers, he told him, that Mr. *Oaſland* " was a traitor and a rebel, *&c.* The poor man ſtood up " for his miniſter, and vindicated him; whereupon he " was, with great zeal, carried to the Court of Guard. " He that preſided there (who was no meaner man than " an *Apparitor*) commanded the old man to be tied neck " and heels, charg'd him with having a hand in the " Presbyterian plot, and threaten'd him with ſevere uſage " if he would not confeſs. The old man bore his wrath " with great patience, and gave him not a word in an- " ſwer. Upon which the man in authority was ſo en- " rag'd that he put lighted matches betwen his fingers, " and burnt them to the very bone to make him confeſs. " At length, Mrs. *Yarrington* diſcovering the ſham in- " trigue, by the acknowledgment which the perſon im- " ploy'd by Sir *J. P.* to carry the packet to *Cole* of " *Martley*, made to his brother, ſhe gives notice of it to

" her

" her husband in his confinement, who immediately en-
" ters actions againſt thoſe who impriſon'd him. Being
" at laſt diſcharg'd, he comes up to *London*, and prevail'd
" with the Earl of *Briſtol* to acquaint the King, how his
" miniſters impos'd upon him by ſuch ſham plots, *&c.*
" Upon this, the Deputy Lieutenants were order'd to
" appear at the Council Board. They endeavour'd to
" clear themſelves, and deſir'd to conſult thoſe in the
" country. But afterwards Sir *J. W.* who was one of
" them, arreſts the Captain for high treaſon. He was
" again releas'd upon the Earl of *Briſtol's* procuring the
" King's Privy Seal, and going down into the country,
" proſecutes his proſecutors. But within ſix months, per-
" ſons were ſuborn'd to ſwear againſt him : *That he had*
" *ſpoken treaſonable words againſt the King and government.*
" For this he was tried at the Aſſizes at *Worceſter*, be-
" fore Judge *Twiſden*, and, upon a full hearing, was pre-
" ſently acquitted by the Jury. And one of the witneſſes
" afterwards confeſs'd he had 5 *l.* given him for being
" an evidence. " *

Having given this Specimen, I ſhall not tranſcribe what was done in other counties, where the like methods were purſu'd. Now the deſign of all theſe methods was, to poſſeſs the Parliament, that it was abſolutely neceſſary to make a ſevere Act againſt the Presbyterians, as a moſt reſtleſs and ſeditious people. The King made uſe of theſe ſtirs, as a handle in his Speech to the Parliament, to provoke them to ſeverity ; and Sir *J. P.* and other Members in the Houſe of Commons gave information of theſe dangerous plots. By theſe arts they procur'd the paſſing of the Uniformity Act, tho at laſt it was but by a very ſmall majority. And thus the Church of *England* obtain'd that eſtabliſhment, in which they glory and triumph to this day.

Our Author next relates the *Riſing of the Fifth Monarchy Men.* † But ſince we always abhorr'd the frantic actions of thoſe murdering zealots, as much as any of our Adverſaries; I can't ſee any reaſon he had to mention this in the Hiſtory of our controverſy.

And as little reaſon had he to ſpeak of the next conſpiracy, of ſome of *Cromwel's Captains, and others who had*

* *See* Cal. Abridg. *Pag.* 177. † *Pag.* 81.

had been Members of the Rump Parliament, with a design *to put all power again into the hands of the Sectaries.* Such a plot was not likely to be promoted by us, who have always been averse to those kind of men, nor are we charg'd by our Author himself with having any hand in it.

And now the Presbyterian and Nonconformist Ministers being hinder'd by the Act of Uniformity from preaching, they began to set up private Conventicles. * Herein they imitated the primitive Christians, who, in like manner, held their assemblies in private, when it was not safe for them to do it in public. And in no other sense could those full assemblies, our Author speaks of, be call'd *Conventicles*, than were the Christian assemblies under the Heathen Emperours. But we have learn'd patiently to bear their opprobrious language; tho' we could easily mind him, that if any Christian assemblies deserve the name of *Conventicles*, it will best belong to those, who set up a tyrannical government in the Church; or who, to its great prejudice and mischief are so mean spirited, as to put their necks under such a yoke. The Doctor acknowledges their congregations were then large, nor did they grow thin, till the Court by their arts had brought a deluge of impiety upon the nation. It gall'd our Adversaries to see our congregations full, and their own thin; and therefore they had recourse, according to their usual manner, to the Popish weapons to advance their cause: and hereupon was that *Statute made against Conventicles.* Of the penalty of this law he gives a true account. *A Law*, says he, *is pass'd under the penalty of five pounds and three months imprisonment, That no person above sixteen years of age, under colour or pretence of any exercise of religion, should be present at any public worship perform'd in other manner, than is allow'd by the Liturgy or practice of the Church of* England. *For the second offence the penalty is doubled. And the third time being convicted by a Jury, the offending party shall be banish'd to some one of the* American *Plantations* [*excepting* New England *and* Virginia.] So far is nothing but truth, tho' it be a barbarous one: what follows is false: *But this law, by reason of the great severity thereof, had no effect.* † By reason of that law, not only Ministers, but Laymen, were sadly persecuted and had their houses

* *Pag.* 83. † *Pag.* 84.

houſes plunder'd. It was a great hardſhip, that by this law a Juſtice of Peace had power to record a man an offender, without a Jury; and if he did it ever ſo unreaſonably, the injur'd perſon could have no remedy. And conſidering what ſort of men were put into the Commiſſion of Peace by the Court; it could be no wonder that the ſufferings of both Miniſters and people ſhould be then exceeding great.

MDCLXV. This year the great Plague rag'd in *London*, which ſwept off about 10000 perſons a week: and yet ſo much were men hardned and blinded, that they would not take notice of God's hand, or fear the vengeance of the Almighty. This appear'd in the behaviour of our Parliament, which being driven from *London* by the Plague, met at *Oxford*, and there paſs'd a more ſevere Act againſt the Miniſters, than any of the former; concerning which our Author thus diſcourſes:

But as for the moſt part misfortunes irritate mens tempers, and make them peeviſh, ſo ſeveral of the ejected Miniſters are accus'd, as if their pulpits were again thundering againſt the Church and the monarchy. I make not the leaſt doubt, that what the Doctor ſpeaks of, as happening *for the moſt part*, our Adverſaries expected and hoped would have fallen out at that time: *viz.* that the Miniſters, being irritated by the vile, barbarous and unchriſtian uſage they met with, would be tempted to ſome extravagance, which might be improv'd againſt them, as an occaſion of further ſeverities. But miſſing their expectation, they would not wait for the formality of a provocation; but, without any offer'd by them, enacted the ſevereſt law againſt them. Had there been any evidence of the truth of this accuſation, we ſhould not fail to hear of it. And if there had been any thing more than rumours of this nature, 'tis very probable the witneſſes were the ſame ſort of ſuborn'd, perjur'd wretches, as thoſe I mention'd juſt now, whoſe aid was made uſe of to blacken the Miniſters in order to obtain the Act of Uniformity. But our Author himſelf ſeems aſham'd of this, and therefore endeavours to mollify it in his next words: *And to take matters in the mildeſt ſenſe, ſome things were ſaid by ſome of them with more freedom and leſs prudence, than were fitting to be utter'd by perſons out of the favour of the government, or to be heard by their governours.* I wonder what things theſe were, and till they are alledg'd and prov'd,

prov'd, I think no regard is to be had to such sham pretences. And if such kind of impertinent rumors, devis'd by adversaries out of spite and malice, be a sufficient ground for the making severe laws against men, no body of men in the world can be long safe. I am sure our Clergy at present, upon much better reason for their treatment of the government, may expect the severest laws to be past against them, if such kind of allegations should be allow'd to carry any strength in them.

'Twas objected likewise against them, that in the choice of Parliament Men, they did too officiously interest themselves; so that upon the death of a Member, oftentimes they should get a new one to be chosen, of not so hearty affections to the Church, or crown, as was desired. I would gladly know, what law was transgress'd by them, when they us'd their utmost industry in this matter. And what kind of persons did they make interest for? Were they such as were not capable of being chosen according to law? The only fault in this matter was, that they chose the most hearty friends to the *English* constitution; men who would secure the liberties of the subjects against the incroachments of the throne, or the Priesthood. Nor can any of them be charg'd with any worse designs against the Church, than that they were for inlarging it by bringing the Dissenters justly and honourably into it. They were in short such men, as have been always the truest friends of the nation, and to whom the preservation of it under God has been continually owing; while all the dangers that have ever threaten'd it have arisen from that kind of men, whom they zealously endeavour'd to keep out. So that really this hardship (to their honour be it spoken) was laid upon them only for their honesty, and their zeal for the happiness and welfare of their country. And if the opposing the crown in elections deserves such treatment, what must become of the *English* Clergy, many of whom have at this day, oppos'd the crown with a Witness, and have been pursuing measures, which, if they had succeeded, must have overthrown our whole constitution in Church, as well as state? And 'tis very remarkable, that when the poor Dissenters were so unmercifully treated for their faithful services to their country at elections, the Papists had free liberty to make what interest they could at them.

Upon

Upon these considerations, another Act of Parliament passed, that no Nonconformist Minister should live within five miles of any corporation town, unless he would take an oath, that he did not hold it lawful, &c. * The form of the oath I shall set down presently, a little more fully than the Doctor has done. But first let me take notice of the severity of the Act in what it forbad, which is too slightly set down by our Author. For if they refus'd the oath, they must not come (unless upon the road) within five miles of any city or corporation, or any place that sends Burgesses to Parliament, or any place where they had been Ministers, or had preach'd since the Act of Oblivion. The design of the Act was to overwhelm, and quite ruine Ministers with these new hardships and troubles. They seem'd to be displeas'd, that God was not as unmerciful as themselves; but was kind to provide for them, stirring up their friends to assist and relieve them; and that they might defeat the kindness of God and their friends, they endeavour to separate them from those, who us'd to succour them. Had they only intended, according to their sham pretences, to hinder their making interest in elections, why did they forbid them to come to such corporations as sent no Members? and why are they forbidden to come there at any time, when there was not, as well as when there was, any election? and why are they forbid to live where they had formerly liv'd, whether Parliament Men were chose there or not? 'Tis plain, the aim was to starve them, for no other reason, but because they were honest and pious men. However cruel the law was in its own nature, they, who were trusted with the execution of it, made it much more so. For when some of the Ministers had found out places for themselves, above five miles from corporations, which they took care to have exactly measur'd; they were driven from them upon this pretence, that the statute did not mean five statute miles, but so many according to common computation. And so great was the severity of that Act, that posterity would hardly believe our Adversaries themselves were capable of using it; if the memory thereof should not be preserv'd by the public records of the nation. The oath impos'd on them was this:

"I

* *Pag.* 85.

" I *A. B.* do ſwear, that it is not lawful, upon any " pretence whatſoever, to take arms againſt the King: " And that I do abhor that traiterous poſition of taking " arms by his authority againſt his perſon, or againſt " thoſe that are commiſſionated by him, in purſuance of " ſuch commiſſion: And that I will not at any time en- " deavour any alteration in the government, either in " Church or ſtate." Had our Adverſaries perform'd their oath to King *James* II. all the aſſiſtance of our good friends the *Dutch*, and the Prince of *Orange*, had been in vain. But bleſſed be God, they no ſooner ſaw the doctrine of that oath would undo themſelves, as well as us, but they very freely gave it up: whereby all the world ſaw with what ſincerity they ſwore to the truth of it. And doubtleſs had they not been convinc'd that our Miniſters uſed to take oaths with more ſincerity and conſcience, than they have ſhewn themſelves, they would never have attempted to give them any trouble by impoſing ſuch an oath upon them.

Moſt of the Nonconformiſts do take this oath. This is not true. About 40 of them took it: twenty in *London*, after the Judges had explain'd it, and one of them too upon the Bench, in the ſofteſt ſenſe poſſible; and about twenty in the country: which is far enough from being the moſt of the Nonconformiſts, who were in the whole about 2000.

But at that time ſeveral of the more ſagacious, both of them and us, began to ſmell out the arts of that Court. Neither was it falſely ſuſpected, that then they began to lay ſnares, at the ſame time to deprive us both of our Reform'd religion, and our civil liberties. Which deſigns, a few years afterwards, did appear in a clearer light.

The firſt part of the oath is taken from a declaration requir'd in the Act of Uniformity; ſo that if this ſerv'd to diſcover the deſigns of the Court, our Adverſaries might have eaſily diſcover'd it long before. And yet however viſible our Author thought them to be at that time; 'tis certain Archbiſhop *Sheldon*, and Biſhop *Ward* of *Salisbury*, two chief men among the Biſhops, were eager ſticklers for the Act with all its notorious cruelty and wickedneſs. The Earl of *Clarendon*, among the temporal Peers, was a great promoter of this ſeverity; as he was of all the other afflictions, which were then laid upon us. But the juſtice of God ſoon overtook him; and he was quickly after

forc'd

forc'd into baniſhment, in which alſo he ended his days. Concerning which I think Mr. *Baxter* makes this juſt obſervation: "It was a notable providence of God, that "this man, that had been the grand inſtrument of ſtate, "and done almoſt all, and had dealt ſo cruelly with the "Nonconformiſts, ſhould thus by his own friends be caſt "out and baniſhed; while thoſe that he had perſecuted, "were the moſt moderate in his cauſe, and many for "him. And it was a great eaſe that befel good people "throughout the land by his dejection. For his way was "to decoy men into conſpiracies, or to pretend plots, "and then upon the rumor of a plot, the innocent peo-"ple of many countries were laid in priſon, ſo that no "man knew when he was ſafe. Whereas ſince then, tho' "laws have been made more and more ſevere; yet a man "knoweth a little better what to expect, when 'tis by "a law that he is to be *try'd.* And 'tis notable, that "he, that did ſo much to make the *Oxford Law* for ba-"niſhing Miniſters from corporations, that took not the "oath, doth in his Letter from *France* ſince his baniſh-"ment ſay, that he never was in favour ſince the Parlia-"ment ſat at *Oxford.*" *

Towards the latter end of this year, came MDCLXXI. forth the King's Indulgence, whereby the King gave the Diſſenters that liberty of worſhipping God according to their conſciences, which they had been depriv'd of by Act of Parliament. The Doctor is angry with the Diſſenters for accepting the benefit of that indulgence.

This occaſion, ſays he, *ſo illegally offer'd, all the different Sects of the Nonconformiſts do greedily lay hold of throughout the city, and the ſeveral market towns in the country; the ſeparate Meetings are ſet up, Miniſters are provided for them, hearers are invited thereunto, and all things are carried on with as much ſpirit and alacrity, as if they had been countenanc'd by the law.* †

And now if our Adverſaries would deal ingenuouſly, they would not blame us ſo much for *greedily laying hold of that occaſion*; as themſelves, for making us by their cruel perſecutions ſtand in any need of it. And why, I pray, ſhall not the Nonconformiſts *lay hold* of that opportunity?

* His Life. *Part* 3. *p.* 20. † *Page* 86.

portunity? If a thief robs a thief, and renders me what I had been before rob'd of; is it unlawful for me to receive what is my own? The worshipping God according to the prescription of a man's conscience, is a right which no good citizen can loose. Since therefore the law itself, which forbad our doing so, was most unjust and unrighteous; what good reason could there possibly be, why we should not make use of that liberty, which is granted us both by the law of nature, and by the written law of God? What, or to whom do we offer any injury or wrong by all this? We know well enough, what their temper is: they never think themselves touch'd in the least, but they make the nation ring with their clamour, and cry out to Foreigners for speedy help and assistance. How then shall it be prov'd, that the Dissenters, alone of all mankind, ought to be so surly, as to refuse to accept of their natural and unalienable rights when offer'd them? I can't really imagine, what the design of this passage should be; unless our Adversaries would have had us forbear upon the royal indulgence to worship God according to our consciences; tho' we had done it in spite of their oppressive laws, and in much affliction and suffering. Do's any man think, we would be such fools, as to lay aside our worship, because the King exempted us from suffering upon the account of it? No, no, we were wiser than that comes to; and understood the temper of our Churchmen too well, to play such a foolish game. We know they who now are angry with us for taking the advantage of the indulgence, would have been the first men in the nation, to have persuaded the King to grant it, if we had shew'd we scrupled the making use of it.

But in February *the Parliament meeting, they voted down the Kings Declaration as illegal, and call those to an account, who had advis'd the King to the setting it forth.* *

The Dissenters truly thought, they had a just right to worship God according to their consciences; and yet they did not therefore think they were bound to defend the King's Declaration. When it became a matter of debate in Parliament, whether that Declaration was consistent with the laws of the land, or not; then they judg'd the liberties of the people, and the security of the constitution

* Pag. 87.

were concern'd: it being a great hazard to allow the King a power of superseding one Act of Parliament by his own prerogative; lest he should be tempted upon the same grounds to supersede whatever Acts he may think fit. The Dissenters therefore, tho they had used the liberty, which the Declaration granted; yet shew'd themselves zealous defenders of the people's rights against the King's absolute power of dispensing with the laws; and therefore readily concur'd in voting the Declaration to be illegal. The Parliament did not enter upon this debate now, upon the account of their old grudge against the Dissenters. Their eyes were open'd to see farther into the design of those measures, which they had been advancing, in complaisance to the Court; and they would have been glad to have had an opportunity to undo a great deal of what they had done. For after they had voted the Declaration illegal, on the 14 of *February*, "The "House of Commons resolv'd, *nemine contradicente*, That "a Bill be brought in for the ease of his Majesty's sub-"jects, who are Dissenters, in matters of religion, from "the Church of *England.*" Accordingly a Bill pass'd the House of Commons, but was stop'd in the House of Lords; where the Bishops by their votes and interest could do a great deal to oppose the Dissenters, and advance the Popish designs of the Court. Thus the poor Dissenters, being depriv'd of the shelter of his Majesty's Declaration, were left by the Parliament to the storm of the severe laws which were in force against them, which by some Justices were rigorously put in execution: but the greater part were then more moderate, and so the Dissenters had in many places *a liberty of performing their worship, in their own way:* our Author says, *for many years*; that is for two years, for it hardly lasted three. For,

In the year 1674. his Majesty call'd the Bishops up to *London*, to give him advice, what was to be done for the securing of religion, *&c.* They (who, our Author says, *began* before this *to smell out the arts of the Court* *) after various consultations with the Ministers of State, advis'd him to recall his licences, and put the laws against the Nonconformists in execution. This advice was presently agreed to by the King. No sooner was the Proclamation against

* p. 35.

againſt us made public, but many *Informers* were ſet at work to advance the deſign, and promote the execution of the laws. Theſe *Informers* were a parcel of infamous wretches, who having no ſenſe of God and another world, but living in all manner of wickedneſs, were thought proper tools for the Church to work with, in perſecuting good men. They were the more fit for the purpoſe, becauſe their wickedneſs had run them deſperately into debt, and they were greedy of any, however ungodly gain. This peſtilent generation were ſingularly diligent in pulling down the Diſſenters, and building up the Church of *England*, as by law eſtabliſhed. And the Spiritual Courts finding how ſerviceable they were to promote diſcipline, that is, to bring money into their pockets, were very fond of them. 'Tis not eaſy to reckon the vaſt number of families, which the Church was pleas'd utterly to ruine by the help of this vermin, who made nothing of perjuring themſelves; but their zeal for Mother Church, made attonement for that ſmall crime, and they were frequently ſhelter'd in ſuch their wickedneſs. But they, who found Means to eſcape puniſhment from men, could not avoid the vengeance of the Almighty; who by the miſerable end of many of them gave warning to others, not to imitate them in their villany. But as there is ſeldom a ſcarcity of perſons fit to be inſtruments of miſchief; while God by his righteous and remarkable judgments remov'd ſome, others came in their room.

The Clergy being griev'd to ſee, what an intereſt the nonconforming Miniſters had in the people, ſet a new project now on foot againſt them, and endeavour'd to expoſe them to be ſcorn'd and ridicul'd. For this end they examin'd their writings, and where they found an unguarded expreſſion they made it a great deal worſe than it was. Such expreſſions as would admit of a good meaning, they wreſted to a bad one; and whatever diſagreed with their notions they made a meer jeſt of, not ſparing religion it ſelf, which was then much wounded thro' our ſides, by men who might have been expected to prove better friends to it. MDCLXXIII.

And indeed the controverſy the Doctor is now going to relate, was not properly a controverſy between the Church of *England* and Diſſenters; but between ſome angry Eccleſiaſtics on the one hand, and ſober pious men, both Conformiſts and Nonconformiſts, on the other. I

don't think it worth while to insist long upon this matter. Dr. *Owen*'s works are known and valued abroad: and by them the Forreign Divines may judge of the writings of the two others, Dr. *Jacomb*, and Mr. *Vincent*, who are join'd with him. And here at home these writers are all so well known, that 'tis needless for me to say much of them. Let every one judge of them as he sees cause. 'Tis invidious and unfair to represent them as *Antinomians*, from such consequences as adversaries may draw from their doctrines, when they deny those consequences. Nor did ever Dr. *Owen*, or either of the other two, *lay down this doctrine, that Christ in our stead had so fulfill'd all the law for us, as to merit heaven for the most wicked and sinful person*; viz. that died in his impenitence and unbelief. And I suppose, no one will question whether he merited heaven for the most wicked and sinful persons, who repent and believe. Nor is it a fair representation of their opinion, to say they taught, *That moral virtues were signs of a carnal mind.* They embrac'd no other doctrine, than what the Church delivers in her 13 Article: "Works done "before the grace of Christ, and the inspiration of his "Spirit, are not pleasant to God; for as much as they "spring not of faith in Jesus Christ, neither do they "make men meet to receive grace, or (as the School "authors say) deserve grace, of congruity: yea, rather "for that they are not done as God hath willed and "commanded them to be done, we doubt not but they "have the nature of sin." And what shall we think of men, who will scoff at the doctrine of their own Church, and will not bear others should preach, what they have most religiously subscrib'd themselves? And who doubts, whether religion may not be said, in a good sense, to *consist chiefly in loving Christ?* Faith and love are frequently join'd together as principal and chief things in Christianity; and certainly all moral virtues are to flow in Christians from love to Christ, or else they are not properly Christian virtues; and our Adversaries will not easily find these writers endeavour'd to disparage those virtues, when thus exercis'd. And tho' some unwary expressions might perhaps fall from some men; yet it cannot be denied, that the errour of abundance of the Clergy was far greater, who left Christ very much out of their divinity, and preach'd not moral virtue, as they ought to have done, upon a Christian foundation. I pass over the other expressions

sions our Author here speaks of, which are to be met with in writers of his own side, and some of them in the Holy Scriptures themselves.

What Mr. *William Sherlock* endeavour'd to expose in the Dissenters, was defended by *Edward Polhil* Esq; a Gentleman eminent for piety and learning, who liv'd and died in the communion of the Church of *England*. Tho' Mr. *Sherlock* was his friend and acquaintance, he could not be silent, when he saw religion and piety struck at by him. But as Mr. *Sherlock* set up for a wit, and treated these things in a jocular way; Mr. *Vincent Alsop*, one of our Ministers, a most ingenious and facetious man, took him in hand: and tho' he treated serious matters with a great deal of gravity; yet where the Gentleman was upon the merry pin, he so wittily and sharply turn'd the jest upon him, that he beat him at his own weapon: and Mr. *Sherlock* never dar'd to answer him, nor much car'd for that way of writing afterward. And that he obtain'd a compleat victory is acknowledg'd by Dr. *South*, a man famous for his wit, and as bitter an enemy as any to the Dissenters. And not only the Dissenters, but several of the Episcopal writers, as Dr. *South* and Dr. *Edwards*, accuse him as having given a deep wound to religion by his writings at that time; which I hope from some of his after writings he was not insensible of. There are some things which one cannot read without horror. Let me give one instance of this nature:

Dr. *Owen* had said, "That in Christ God hath manifested the naturalness of this righteousness unto him, in "that it was impossible that it should be diverted from "sinners, without the interposing of a propitiation." Every one knows this has been a receiv'd opinion among a great many Divines, the far greater part, I suppose, of those in Foreign countries. But if it should be suppos'd to be false; yet it was very indecent in a man, who profess'd himself a Christian and a Divine, to treat so very serious and important a subject with flouts and jesting. Yet this did Mr. *Sherlock*, who presently upon setting down the Doctor's words, goes on after this rate: "That is, that "God is so just and righteous, that he cannot pardon "sin without a satisfaction to his justice. Now this in- "deed is such a notion of justice as is perfectly new, which "neither Scripture nor nature acquaints us with. For "all mankind have accounted it an act of goodness

" (without the leaſt ſuſpicion of injuſtice in it) to remit " injuries and offences, without exacting any puniſhment; " and that he is ſo far from being juſt, that he is cruel " and ſavage, who will remit no offence till he hath ſatiſ- " fied his revenge.—— But tho' this be a very terrible diſ- " covery of the naturalneſs of God's righteouſneſs, or vin- " dictive juſtice, yet he makes ſome amends for it, in " that comfortable diſcovery of his patience and long " ſuffering towards ſinners; for now (as he adds) in " Chriſt *the very nature of God is diſcover'd to be love and* " *kindneſs.* A happy change this, from all juſtice to all " love! But how comes this to paſs? Why the account " of that is very plain: Becauſe (if I may take liberty to " to put his words into plain *Engliſh*) the juſtice of God " hath glutted it ſelf with revenge on ſin in the death of " Chriſt, and ſo henceforward we may be ſure, he will " be very kind; as a revengeful man is, when his paſſion " is over. For ſo he ſpeaks very honourably of God: " *Whatever diſcoveries were made of the patience and lenity* " *of God unto us; yet if it were not withal reveal'd, that* " *the other properties of God, as his juſtice, and revenge* " *for ſin, had their actings alſo aſſign'd them to the full,* " *there could be little conſolation gather'd from the former.* " That is: He would not believe God himſelf, tho' he " ſhould make never ſo many promiſes of being good " and gracious to ſinners; unleſs he were ſure he had firſt " ſatisfy'd his revenge. Which indeed is ſuch a chara- " cter of the love and patience of God, as we could ne- " ver have learnt, had not ſome men falſely pretended " to ſuch an acquaintance with the perſon of Chriſt, as " contradicts thoſe natural notions which all men have of " God, and the plain revelation of the Goſpel. The ſum " of which is: That God is all love and patience, when " he hath taken his full of revenge. As others uſe to ſay: " *That the Devil is very good, when he is pleas'd.*" * This is that Dr. *Sherlock*, and ſuch were the writings ſo much commended here by our Author. The ſame perſon denies there is any other, than a political union between Chriſt and believers; and laughs at thoſe who pretend any other, of which the Spirit, or faith are the band. He ridicules thoſe, who taught in their ſermons, That it was neceſſary for ſinners

* Of the Knowledge of Chriſt, *p.* 27.

sinners to see themselves miserable and wretched without the help of Christ, before they would be brought savingly to believe on him. And 'twere easy to present the reader with a great deal more such stuff, if I car'd for the dirty work of looking after it.

Next follows a long account of the controversy between Mr. *Jenkyn* and Dr. *Grove*. Whether his account of the *Sermon*, which I never saw, or of the management of the dispute be true, I know not. If Mr. *Jenkyn* manag'd it weakly, we are not concern'd in it. For it was not a controversy about Conformity as far as I perceive; but about the opinions of some particular Divines of the Church of *England*, which are not put into the Articles, or requir'd to be subscrib'd to. This Mr. *Jenkyn* might have been spar'd by our Author, considering that if he did really deal badly by the Church of *England*, they afterwards in 1684 reveng'd themselves to the full upon him. He was then taken at a Fast, and by two of their magistrates, upon his refusing the *Oxford oath*, sent to *Newgate* very cruelly; for they refus'd the offer of 40 *l.* fine, which the law impower'd them to take; altho' it was urg'd, that the air of *Newgate* would infallibly suffocate him. No petitions could be heard for his release. And when his Physicians testify'd his life was in danger from his close imprisonment, all the answer that could be obtain'd was: That Mr. *Jenkyn* should be a prisoner as long as he liv'd. And so at a week and four months end, he ended his days in their merciful hands. He was deny'd in his imprisonment the liberty of praying with any, even his own Daughter who came to visit him. His Life might have aton'd therefore for his offence; unless they think the more they sink his reputation, the more excusable they shall be in taking it away.

This year the Popish Plot was discover'd, MDCLXXVIII: into which when the Parliament resolv'd to make a diligent search, they were dissolv'd; after they had continued long enough to make severe laws against the Dissenters, and to see cause to repent of what they had done. The next year another Parliament was call'd, which beginning where the former left off, was soon dissolv'd also.

The year after another Parliament was call'd. MDCLXXX: The Papists now had recourse to their old practices. The Popish Lords, imprison'd in the *Tower* for

the plot, contriv'd a ſham Presbyterian Plot, the better to ſmother their real one. It is not eaſy to expreſs how greedily the *Engliſh* Clergy catch'd at that opportunity of venting their malice againſt not only the poor Diſſenters, but all Presbyterians abroad. Of this I could give many inſtances from the faſhionable ſermons, which appear'd in print upon that occaſion. But I ſhall only mention one Preacher, whom the Parliament has made famous by taking notice of him, and impeaching him.

This was Mr. *Richard Thompſon*, a Miniſter in *Briſtol*, who in a Sermon on the 30 of *January* 1679, told his auditory in the pulpit: "That the Presbyterians were "ſuch perſons as the very Devil bluſh'd at them: that "they were worſe, and far more intolerable than the "Prieſts or Jeſuits: that a Presbyterian Brother, *qua talis*, "*as ſuch*, was as great a traitor by the ſtatute, as any "Prieſt or Jeſuit whatſoever: that the Presbyterians did "outvy *Mariana*, and that *Calvin* was the firſt that "preached the king-killing doctrine: that there was a "great noiſe of a Popiſh Plot; but there was nothing in "it but a Presbyterian Plot." The Popiſh Plot, which was moſt certain and unqueſtionable; was decry'd by this man as fabulous; while the ſham of a Presbyterian Plot deſerv'd with him the utmoſt credit. But no wonder the Papiſts found ſo much favour at his hands, conſidering what he elſewhere declar'd: "That he had been very "often (and above one hundred times) at Maſs, in the "great Church at *Paris*, and uſually gave half a crown "to get a place to hear a certain Doctor of that Church, "and that he was like to be brought over to that reli"gion; and that when he went beyond ſea, he did not "know but that he might be of that religion before his "return: that if he were as well ſatisfy'd of other "things, as he was of Juſtification, auricular Confeſſion, "Penance, extream Unction, and Chriſm in Baptiſm, "he would not have been ſo long ſeparated from the Ca"tholic Church. *He affirm'd:* The Church of *Rome* "was the true Catholic Church, and greatly commended "the decency of ſolemnizing the Maſs in *France*, and "ſaid that it was perform'd with much more reverence "and devotion than any other religion doth uſe. *He ſaid:* "That after Excommunication by the Biſhop, with"out Abſolution from the ſpiritual Court, ſuch a one was "ſurely damn'd, and he would pawn his ſoul for the

"truth

" truth of it." And ſpeaking concerning the Diſſenters, he declared: " He would hall them out, and fill the goals " with them, and hoped to ſee their houſes a fire about " their ears ſhortly". Upon this, and ſome other things witneſſed againſt him, it was reſolved, *nemine contradicente*: " That *Richard Thompſon* Clerk, hath publicly " defam'd his ſacred Majeſty, and preach'd ſedition, vili- " fy'd the Reformation, promoted Popery, by aſſerting " Popiſh principles, decrying the Popiſh Plot, and turning " the ſame upon the Proteſtants; and endeavour'd to " ſubvert the liberty and property of the ſubject, and the " rights and privileges of Parliament; and that he is a " ſcandal, and a reproach to his function."

" And that the ſaid *Richard Thompſon* be impeach'd " upon the ſaid report, and reſolution of the Houſe, *&c.*"

And unleſs ſome certain perſons were infected with this man's principles, they would not delate ſo much upon the *Rye Houſe Plot*, when they ſo ſlightly paſs over the Popiſh Plot. *Thompſon* for this was made Dean of *Briſtol*.

I may ſay the leſs concerning the *Bill of Excluſion*, becauſe our Author has in the main given no ill account of it. He owns the Diſſenters were for the Bill, and *the greateſt part of their Church againſt it*; * but ſays, there were *great numbers of the Church, who had a particular zeal for the liberty of the people*, who were for it. This is all very true. Only I would here remark, that thoſe *great numbers of their Church*, he ſpeaks of, were among the Laity; there being very few of the Clergy who had the courage, or honeſty, to ſhew themſelves favourers of it. And thoſe of their Church, who were for it, fell under as much reproach and hatred among the reſt: as the Diſſenters themſelves; which alſo continues to this day. He ſhould have added too: That as the Bill was loſt in the Houſe of Lords, ſo the Biſhops were then ſome of the chief ſticklers againſt it; being very near, if not quite, to a man againſt it. So that we owe the loſs of that Bill, as we do a great deal more, to the Church.

The ſtrength of the Church's plea againſt the Bill, is not amiſs repreſented by Dr. *Nichols*. I wiſh he had expos'd the weakneſs of it alſo. He ſays, *They had theſe objections againſt that deſign: That this deſign was only an*

* *Pag.* 92.

an introduction to some other, which durst not yet be own'd: There has been somewhat very unaccountable in the conduct of these men all along. The design of introducing Popery was plain all through that reign; and they themselves now own it, and complain of themselves for coming too late to the knowledge of it; and our just fears of it, and endeavours to oppose it, were charg'd upon us as proceeding from unreasonable suspicions and malicious designs. On the other hand, however angry they were with us for our suspicions, they made no difficulty of insinuating thro' the nation the most whimsical and silly suspicions of the designs of all those who oppos'd them. And that nonsensical cant of republican principles, was a sort of *term of art*, to disgrace any party or design; and so it has continued ever since, and more especially of late. Not that they who use it, much believe there is any foundation for the insinuation; but it serves their purpose to blacken their enemies, Now these suspicions have been confuted by the whole conduct of the persons suspected. The Presbyterians, who are chiefly struck at, were displeas'd with the commonwealth, when it was set up; were the men who overturn'd it by bringing in the King; and never made the least attempt toward the setting up a commonwealth ever since. And yet these *Chimera*'s must be made reasons for the Church's opposing the most noble designs. For this is what he means these things were an introduction to, as appears by what follows: *and that men of republican principles began with disinheriting one person of the Royal Family, to make way for the extirpation of the whole:* Were then the Honourable House of Commons turn'd *republican?* If a few Dissenters in the House were chargeable with such principles; had the Churchmen, who were such a great number therein, embrac'd the same? Besides, as there was nothing of such a design appear'd in the Bill, 'twas time enough to oppose it, as soon as it should discover it self. The Bill neither remov'd the King, nor the House of Lords, who would, if the Bill had become an Act, be ready at hand to crush any such attempts. But the Bill it self design'd to secure the monarchy, as appears by the words of it: " In case the said *James* " Duke of *York* should survive his now Majesty, and the " heirs of his Majesty's body; the said imperial crown " shall descend to, and be enjoy'd by such person or per- " sons successarily, during the life of the said *James* Duke

" of

" of *York*, as ſhould have inherited and enjoy'd the ſame, " in caſe the ſaid *James* Duke of *York* were naturally " dead, and thing contain'd in this Act to the contrary " notwithſtanding." *that there were many of the ſame perſons who would deprive the Son of his ſucceſſion, who had depriv'd the Father of his life.* This was doubtleſs a falſe ſuggeſtion. For I don't believe there was ſo much as one ſingle perſon then in the Houſe of Commons, who had any hand in King *Charles*'s death. *That if this law ſhould be paſs'd by the King and Parliament, the Duke of* York *would not ſtick to vindicate his right of ſucceſſion by the ſword: that they having lately experienc'd the miſeries of a civil war, they were not ſo overfond of it again; nor could they eaſily ſuffer their wounds, which were hardly healed, to be torn up afreſh.* Was not this, think we, a wiſe reaſon? Was there not more danger of a civil war in driving him out, then there was in preventing his coming in? It was a wiſe anſwer an honourable Member of the Houſe made to this objection, when the Bill was debated in the Houſe: *There is a lion in the Lobby; keep him out, ſay I No, ſay ſome, open the door, we will chain him, when he is come in.* And no one need be told, what the loſs of that Bill has coſt the nation ſince that time. And our Adverſaries we ſee could eaſily alter their principles, and ſet aſide a great many perſons, who were nearer to the crown; or we ſhould never have enjoy'd the preſent ineſtimable bleſſing of a Proteſtant ſucceſſion: which (tho' we dont grudge the coſt) we might have had upon much eaſier terms; had it not been for that meanneſs and baſeneſs with which they made their court to a Popiſh King, and a Popiſh ſucceſſor.

This Houſe had likewiſe brought in a Bill for a *Comprehenſion*, and another for an *Indulgence*; which were both read twice: but the King firſt prorogued, and then diſſolv'd the Parliament. However before they roſe, they came to this reſolution: " That 'tis the opinion of this " Houſe, that the proſecution of Proteſtant Diſſenters " upon the penal laws, is at this time grievous to the " ſubject, a weakening the Proteſtant intereſt, an en- " couragement to Popery, and dangerous to the peace of " the kingdom." And yet the Churchmen went on moſt grievouſly to perſecute us, notwithſtanding the Houſe of Commons had expreſs'd their ſence of the great danger the Reformation was in, and how much it was heighten'd by ſuch perſecuting methods. And

And as tho' the Diſſenters had not miſery enough upon them from the penal laws, they were inſulted as ſeditious and ſchiſmatical people by their Adverſaries, in the Pamphlets they publiſh'd againſt them. Among the reſt, Dr. *Stillingfleet* counted it a glory to inſult the oppreſſed; preaching a bitter Sermon againſt them before the Lord Mayor, which he afterwards printed. Nor can it ſeem ſtrange, that the fiery zealots ſhould then ſhew their rage, when not only the King commanded the laws to be put in execution; but ſuch learned men, as had before behav'd themſelves with much moderation and temper, began to inflame mens paſſions againſt us.

MDCLXXXII. The perſecution therefore lay very heavy upon the Diſſenters for ſeveral years afterwards. And many Miniſters were impriſon'd, and their goods ſeiz'd and ſold; and this without their having the leaſt notice of any accuſation, or receiving any ſummons to appear and anſwer for themſelves, or their ever ſeeing the Juſtices or their accuſers. I forbear to mention the rudeneſs uſed toward woman upon ſuch occaſions, and how they purpoſely frighted children; tho I ſhall not eaſily forget, how I was my ſelf, being very young and in a Miniſter's houſe, when it was broke open, put in great fear of my life by them; which together with what I then ſaw, begat in me ſuch an averſion to their cruel and perſecuting practices, as I hope will never wear off. Warrants were ſign'd for diſtreſſes in one pariſh, that of *Hackney*, to the value of 1400 *l.* * What ſpoil then did they make, may we think, in the reſt of the nation?

Mr. *Nathanael Vincent*, a moſt pious Miniſter, and an excellent Preacher, was this year tried at the Quarter Seſſions in *Surrey*; and by the help of a pack'd Jury was, for no other Crime than preaching the Goſpel, caſt, and condemn'd to be baniſh'd. But after he had procur'd at a vaſt charge, a hearing of his cauſe before other Judges, and had lain long in priſon, he was releas'd by the King, at the Interceſſion of ſome Noble perſons about him.

MDCXXXIII. This year the perſecution did not abate; and warrants were out againſt many, and ſeveral

* *Not* 14000 *l. as, by miſtake, was ſaid in the firſt Edition.*

veral Miniſters were diſtrein'd upon. Perſons taken at Meetings were convicted as rioters, and fin'd 10 *l.* a piece; and ſome young perſons (of both ſexes) being taken at them, were ſent to *Bridewel*, to beat hemp among rogues and whores.

This year was that *Rye Houſe Plot*, in relating which our Author is very particular. * An abominable forgery (if taken according to his account of it) which now gains credit with none, but thoſe who are miſerably enſlav'd by the ſpirit of a party. The writer of the Hiſtory of that Plot, from whom our Author alſo has receiv'd what he ſays of it, was Dr. *Thomas Sprat*, Biſhop of *Rocheſter*, a Man who had an excellent pen, and which he could uſe for any purpoſes. He is much more famous for a noble *Panegyric* upon *Oliver Cromwell*, than for his *Hiſtory* of this *Plot*. And indeed he himſelf ſeem'd not very well pleas'd with what he had done, when afterwards he wrote his *Apology*, which he might have entituled his *Retractation*. Remarkable are thoſe words which he uſes in his own defence. Speaking of my Lord *Ruſſel*, and ſome others, whom he calls perſons of honour, he ſays: "I "could not hinder, nor did I in the leaſt contribute to "their fall: nay, I lamented it; eſpecially my Lord "*Ruſſel*'s after I was fully convinc'd by diſcourſe with "the reverend Dean of *Canterbury*, of that noble Gen-"tleman's great probity and conſtant abhorrence of fal-"ſhood. †

But if the conſpiracy had been ſuch as he relates, my Lord *Ruſſel* and all his fellow conſpirators had deſerv'd, not only to be hated and abhorr'd of all good men, but to ſuffer the ſevere puniſhment which was inflicted upon them; nor would the Biſhop have needed to ſay any thing to defend or excuſe himſelf for what he had written. Further, the ſame Biſhop confeſſes: "That King *James* "the Second called for his papers, and after he had read "them, altered divers paſſages before the Book was "printed." ‖

What aſſurance then can we have of any matter from ſuch an Hiſtory? It ſeems indeed probable enough, in my opinion, that thoſe excellent perſons enter'd into much ſuch

* *Pag.* 94. † *P.* 8. Of the Biſhop of *Rocheſter*'s Letter to the E. of *Dorſet*.
‖ *Ibid. P.* 7.

ſuch a conſultation, as the Biſhops and beſt men of the nation did in K. *James* the Second's reign; who when they ſaw our civil and religious liberties were deſign'd to be deſtroy'd, contriv'd what they ſhould do to ſave both. The former therefore ought not to be condemn'd, if the other are juſtify'd and applauded. But I am ſorry to obſerve that thoſe, who ſeem ambitious upon ſome occaſions of being thought men of temper and moderation, ſhould, when they come to treat of this, write in the ſtile and ſpirit of the High Church. He ſays:

The Earl of Eſſex, *being accus'd of the conſpiracy, is ſuppos'd by ſome to have laid violent hands upon himſelf, out of conſciouſneſs of that crime.** By ſome: by whom, I pray? By the Papiſts; may it perhaps be ſaid. But they underſtand their own deſigns or practices better, than to ſuppoſe any ſuch thing, whatever they may pretend to the contrary. But 'tis *ſuppos'd* by ſome wiſe and prudent men, who are Proteſtants. Who can believe that? who can think any Proteſtant, that has any ſenſe and honour, can pretend to believe, the Earl of *Eſſex* ſhould be able himſelf to cut thro' his wind-pipe, his gullet, both the jugulars, to the vertebres of the neck; and then go to his chamber window, and fling out the bloody razor? Theſe and a great many other abſurdities muſt a man believe, if he will believe the Earl of *Eſſex* murder'd himſelf. 'Twas plain to any man that would make any obſervation, that the Earl of *Eſſex* was murder'd, in order to their compaſſing the murder of my Lord *Ruſſel*. For the murder was ſo contriv'd, as that the news of it might come juſt as my Lord *Ruſſel* was at the bar, and the Attorney General and the Lord Chief Juſtice, made great uſe of this, as an evidence of my Lord's guilt. And the Lord Chief Juſtice in ſumming up the evidence to the Jury, told them: "That there was nothing could be ſaid, in favour "of my Lord *Ruſſel*'s innocency, as to what he was ac- "cus'd of; but what might be more ſtrongly alledg'd in "behalf of the Earl of *Eſſex*; who nevertheleſs from a "conſciouſneſs of being guilty of that deſperate conſpi- "racy, had brought himſelf to an untimely end, to avoid "the methods of public juſtice." This was ſo manag'd by the King's Counſel, as to influence the Jury (as ſome of

* Pag. 95.

of them confeſs'd) more than all the evidence brought againſt him. In one word, there are none who give any heed to this ſtory, but Papiſts and High Church men; the former that they may hide their own Wickedneſs; the latter that they may have an advantage of reviling and abuſing the Diſſenters.

Antony *Earl of* Shaftsbury, *who was ſaid to have had the chief direction in this contrivance, fled beyond the ſeas, and died in baniſhment.*

The Papiſts had ſeveral times conſpir'd to take away his life, and he ſaw innocence was no ſecurity to a perſon in *England*; but the Court by the help of corrupt Judges and pack'd Juries carry'd every thing, right or wrong, juſt as they pleas'd; and therefore he muſt be allow'd to have acted wiſely in departing the kingdom, and ſo providing for his own ſafety. How happy had it been, if my Lord *Ruſſel* had taken the ſame courſe! He, relying too much upon his own innocence, and the teſtimony of a good conſcience, refus'd to make his eſcape, when he had an opportunity; and ſo he fell a ſacrifice to the rage of his murderers, who might have reſerv'd himſelf for the ſervice of his country.

Far be it from us, that we ſhould accuſe all the Nonconformiſts for having a hand in this conſpiracy, few of which, perhaps, before the public detection thereof, did ever hear of it.

The Nonconformiſts are wonderfully oblig'd to them for this civility; and ſo are the aſhes of the dead, that they uſe them with ſo much tenderneſs and moderation; and that they ſhew themſelves ſatisfy'd with making them conſpirators, without making them egregious fools at the ſame time. But if we may now ſpeak the truth freely, the romantic account here ſet down of this Plot, was never heard of by any mortal, before the Courtiers deviſ'd it out of their own brains.

But that Dr. Owen, *Mr.* Mead, *Mr.* Griffith, *Nonconformiſt Miniſters were made acquainted therewith, the Duke of* Monmouth, *and Mr.* Carſtairs, *unexceptionable witneſſes in this caſe, do atteſt.*

If the Reverend Mr. *Carſtairs* had confeſs'd any heinous matter as done by them, ſurely there would be more reaſon to attribute his confeſſion to his weakneſs, than to reproach the Nonconformiſts with it. Was not that confeſſion extorted from him with the moſt barbarous and illegal

illegal cruelty; which our Adverſaries, if they acted prudently, ſhould never mention, that it might if poſſible be forgotten? I hardly think, the Papiſts and High Church (who acted then, as they have lately, like dear friends) gave a more flagrant proof of their injuſtice and inhumanity in any man, whom they did not outright murder, than they did in that excellent perſon. He was firſt taken up in *England*, and kept cloſe priſoner for ſeveral weeks in the *Gatehouſe*: Then he apply'd to the Court of *King's Bench*, that he might be brought to a trial, or admitted to bail, according to law. But they would not bring him to his trial here, becauſe they were ſenſible they had not ſufficient witneſſes againſt him; and ſo they immediately ſent him to *Scotland*, to be try'd there for crimes committed in that kingdom, where he had not been for ſeveral years. The true reaſon was, they could not in *England* put him to the torture; and they hop'd by that in *Scotland*, they might force him to make as ample a confeſſion as they deſir'd. When he was before the Privy Council in *Scotland*, he deſir'd to know if his Majeſty's Advocate, or Attorney General, had any crime to accuſe him of, that was committed in *Scotland*. The Advocate plainly ſaid he had none. Hereupon Mr. *Carſtairs* pleaded his Majeſty's warrant, by which he was ſent to *Scotland*, that did expreſly bear, That he was to be try'd for crimes committed there: but that was not regarded, and he was plainly told, he muſt either anſwer upon oath ſuch queſtions as ſhould be propounded to him, or ſuffer one torment after another, while he had life in him. And when he begg'd, that ſeeing he was not accus'd of any crimes committed in *Scotland*, he might meet with no greater ſeverity in his own country, than the laws of the land, where it was ſaid he had committed crimes, did allow of; he had no other anſwer, but that he muſt reſolve upon continued torture, if he did not what is above mention'd.

Accordingly he was put to the torture, which he patiently bore for near an hour and a half, having both his thumbs at once bruiſed betwixt two irons, by a new model of that engine of torture, which was call'd *Thummikins*; which tho' it did not go ſo far, as to drive the marrow out of the bones, yet was next door to it. This torture made both his arms ſwell greatly, and made him feaveriſh; he begg'd therefore he might have reſpite for a day or two;

two; but his requeſt was deny'd: ſo the next day he was brought out of the priſon, to ſuffer a new torture, which he was reſolv'd thro' God's aſſiſtance to undergo, if they had not offer'd him better conditions than they did before. Theſe conditions he accepted, and ſo they took his confeſſion, which they printed in a very defective manner. Nay, he declar'd to thoſe who were then in the government of *Scotland*, he ſhould be much injur'd by the printing thoſe depoſitions, becauſe they were lame and defective; ſeeing neither the queſtions which were askt him, nor the true and juſt extenuations he gave of the affair in general were ſet down, but only the bare anſwers to queſtions. For they knew he had declar'd that all the buſineſs, which made ſuch a noiſe, amounted to no more than diſcourſes what might be fit to be done for preſerving their religion and liberties, without any deſign againſt the perſon of the King or the monarchy. He then alſo vindicated himſelf and others, from the aſperſion of being concern'd in the contrivance of any aſſaſſinating deſigns, which he abhor'd: and they who examin'd him ſaid, they did not believe he was guilty of them.

Further they did not perform the conditions they granted him. Whence he had the juſtice done him by the Parliament, in the beginning of K. *William*'s reign, to have it declar'd and regiſtred in the public records: *That the public faith had been broke to him.* Which a Perſon of Quality, who was an Officer of State when he was tortur'd, own'd in a paper ſubſcrib'd, and given in by him to the Parliament, that it might be put amongſt their records.

Now ſuppoſing he had confeſs'd any wicked deſigns, being overcome by the barbarous uſage he met with, what wiſe man would much regard it? But he confeſs'd nothing concerning thoſe Miniſters, of which an honeſt man and a good ſubject needed to be aſham'd. Let any man read his confeſſion as 'tis publiſhed, he ſhall no where find him ſaying: That Dr. *Owen*, Mr. *Mead*, and Mr. *Griffith* were acquainted with any *abominable conſpiracy of aſſaſſinating the King:* with *the deſign*, our Author tells us, which *was to have him ſhot with a blunderbus, as his coach was to paſs by* Rie-Houſe *in the* New Market *road:* or with the other deſigns, which follow: *The Duke of* York *was likewiſe to be kill'd; and his Daughter, the Princeſs* Anne, *was to be married to ſome mean perſon, that her children*

might thereby have the leſs pretence to the throne: the Keeper of the Great Seal, and ſeveral of the Judges were to be hanged, and their skins ſtuff'd out, to be ſet up publicly before the Courts of Judicature in Weſtminſter Hall, *&c.* Things quite contrary to theſe were atteſted by him. And a friend of mine, who was very intimate with Mr. *Mead*, aſſures me, he has often heard him profeſs there was no ſuch deſign. They conſulted, as Mr. *Carſtairs* own'd, how they might preſerve their religion and liberties. And that we are ſo far from being aſham'd of, that with our Adverſaries good leave we triumph and glory in it, that we were among the firſt and forwardeſt of thoſe, who laid the danger of our dear country to heart, and contriv'd for the preſervation of it. Let the action be fairly reported, and we will thank them for doing us the honour to own the ſhare we had in it. And we let our Adverſaries know, we deſpiſe the cenſure of thoſe, who have the conſcience to reproach us with the ſame thing, they afterwards in King *James* the Second's reign practis'd themſelves. And if thoſe Nonconformiſt Miniſters were really guilty of ſuch a vile conſpiracy, as that deſcrib'd by our Author; how came King *Charles* himſelf to diſcharge Mr. *Mead*, when he appear'd before him in Council? This worthy man was my Guardian, and therefore I think my ſelf bound to pay ſo much reſpect to his memory, as to take this occaſion of acquainting my reader, if he do's not know it already; that he was a Gentleman, and a Scholar, and a moſt excellent Preacher; and that his reputation was too well eſtabliſh'd among thoſe who knew him, to be leſſen'd by ſuch reproaches as are here caſt upon him. Further that Hiſtory of the Plot, which our Author cites, contains ſome notorious falſehoods, which Mr. *Carſtairs* ſays he knew to be ſuch. What I have here related concerning Mr. *Carſtairs*, I have taken from a very civil Letter I receiv'd from that excellent perſon; in whoſe death the Church, and Univerſity of *Edinburgh* have lately ſuſtain'd an unſpeakable loſs.

Dr. *Nichols* proceeds next to give an account of the publiſhing the *London Caſes*.* Theſe were printed by the Divines of their communion, at a time when the Proteſtant

* Pag. 96.

teſtant religion was in the utmoſt danger; ſo that an Anſwer might then have ſeem'd as unſeaſonable, as the Caſes themſelves. Theſe champions of the Church had an art too, to ſecure themſelves from being attack'd by their adverſaries, and wrote when our ſide could not anſwer with either conveniency or ſafety. Their perſecuted condition depriv'd them of leiſure for writing; and if they wrote, they brought upon themſelves freſh troubles and perſecutions.

Thus Mr. *De Laune*, a learned Anabaptiſt, loſt his life, by writing againſt one of the *Caſes* publiſh'd by Dr. *Benjamin Calamy*. For upon no other offence was he thrown into priſon; where the ſtraitneſs of his confinement caſt him into a diſtemper, of which he ſoon died in their hands. And tho' the Doctor in his *Caſe* pretended himſelf very deſirous of an Anſwer, he never made the leaſt attempt to get him releas'd.

By the like kind uſage Mr. *Jenkyn* mention'd already, Mr. *Bamfield*, and Mr. *Ralphſon*, and ſome others at this time got their death, to the great ſhame and diſgrace of their Perſecutors. Nor can I omit mentioning the trial of Mr. *Thomas Roſewell*, which happen'd about this time. He was found guilty of high treaſon upon three moſt ſcandalous perjur'd womens evidence; whoſe perjuries would have been fully prov'd againſt them, could juſtice have been had. He made a handſom and ingenious defence of himſelf; but to no purpoſe, as to his Judge and Jury. But upon a repreſentation of his trial to the King, he was pardon'd; and narrowly miſs'd the glory of dying a Martyr in the cauſe of Chriſt.

For ſuch things the Earl of *Caſtlemain* ſeverely upbraids the Church of *England*, in theſe words, which I find cited from him: "'Twas never known that *Rome* "perſecuted (as the Biſhops do) thoſe who adhere to the "ſame faith with themſelves, and eſtabliſh'd an Inqui- "ſition againſt the profeſſors of the ſtricteſt piety among "themſelves. And however the Prelates complain of the "bloody perſecution under Queen *Mary*, 'tis manifeſt "their perſecution exceeds it: for under her there were "not more than two or three hundred put to death; "whereas under their perſecution, there hath above treble "that number been ſtifled, deſtroyed, and ruin'd in their

" eſtates, lives and liberties, being (as is moſt remarkable)
" men for the moſt part of the ſame ſpirit, and principle
" with thoſe Proteſtants, who ſuffer'd under the Prelates
" in Queen *Mary*'s time." *

But ſince he was a Papiſt, I ſhall add another witneſs, Biſhop *Moreton*, whoſe words the ſame author ſets down thus: " I ought not to eſteem any thing a juſt cauſe of
" ſilencing my ſelf from preaching, for which I ought not
" as willingly to venture my life. The Nonconformiſts
" have ſuffer'd what is next to death, and too many have
" ſuffer'd even unto death in priſons, where ſeveral caught
" their deaths, and others died. Of whom ſhall their
" deaths be requir'd?" † 'Tis no hard matter to give an anſwer to the Biſhop's queſtion: ſince whoſe time a great addition has been made to the number of the Nonconformiſt, either Confeſſors, or Martyrs.

Now this having been the manner of our Adverſaries in confuting and anſwering thoſe who oppoſe them; 'tis no great wonder thoſe Caſes, being publiſh'd at firſt in ſo ſtrait and difficult a time, ſhould have fewer animadverſions made upon them. Our Adverſaries boaſt of them as unanſwerable, and think they can never ſay enough in the praiſe of them. And yet ſome of the chief of them have been anſwer'd, and perhaps more may be. And indeed a gueſs may be made at the Caſes by this Defence of Dr. *Nichols*, who has tranſlated the flower of them into his Book. If I may be allow'd to ſpeak my judgment: The authors of thoſe Caſes many times unfairly repreſent the ſtate of our controverſy; and when they do not, they commonly diſcover much more of an aſſuming, dogmatical way of writing, than of any great ſtrength of argument.

About this time a great number of *French* Proteſtants, being ſorely perſecuted at home, came over into *England*; whoſe neceſſitous circumſtances call'd for the compaſſion and aſſiſtance of their Brethren. Our Adverſaries then gave a notable proof of their friendſhip and affection to Foreign Proteſtants. For when they had collected a large ſum of money, of our people, as well as their own, which was to be given to our poor baniſh'd Brethren in general; they would not ſuffer any one of thoſe poor exiles to receive

* Eleutheria. *p.* 67. † *p.* 73.

ceive a farthing of those contributions, except he first receiv'd the Sacrament according to the manner of the Church of *England*, in the *French* Church in the *Savoy*; and brought a certificate, under the Minister of that Church's hand, that he had done so. Than which they could not well give a fuller proof of their perfidious and barbarous, cruel and unchristian temper. Several of the Articles exhibited against Mr. *Cartwright* were for his varying from the ways of the Church of *England*, when he was out of the realm, at *Antwerp*, and *Middleburg*. Particularly the 8th Article ran thus: "*Item*, that he, the "said *Thomas Cartwright*, in the public administration of "his Ministry there [in those foreign parts] among her "Majesty's subjects, used not the form of Liturgy, nor "Book of Common Prayer, by the laws of this land "established; nor in his government ecclesiastical, the "laws and orders of this land; but rather conform'd him-"self in both to the use and form of some other Foreign "Churches." * Now if this was such a sin in an *English* man to vary from the usages of the Church of *England*, I would fain know, why it must be counted a virtue in a *French* man to vary from the usages of the *French* Churches? or how they can think both these kinds of proceedings can be justify'd?

In the reign of King *James* II, our Author MDCLXXXV. begins with the Rebellion of the Duke of *Monmouth*. *In the beginning*, says he, *of this reign*, James *Duke of* Monmouth, *taking to himself the Royal Title, rais'd an army against King* James. *His head quarters were at* Taunton, *a town in the west of* England, *whither soldiers flock in unto him out of all the different Sects of the Nonconformists, more of which had in all probability join'd him, if he had succeeded in his enterprize.* †

Many of the Nonconformists thought King *Charles* was marry'd to the Duke's mother; and so were persuaded the Duke was the true heir of the crown; and that King *Charles* disown'd his marriage, that he might do the Papists a pleasure by setting him aside. They may therefore be the rather excus'd, that being thus mistaken about his right, they embraced that opportunity of shaking off the tyrannical yoke, and recovering their just liberties, after

* Fuller's Church History, *Book* 9. *p.* 158. † *p.* 97.

they had been miserably oppress'd and persecuted for above twenty years. Or if that mistake of our side is not to be forgiven; we only desire, they may fall under the same censure, who, before they had felt the thousandth part of our hardships, had recourse to the Prince of *Orange*, crying out earnestly for his assistance, and mutually promising him their own. But let us hear how finely he strokes his own party after this censure past upon ours:

But our men stuck by their Prince with a great degree of fidelity. 'Twas no wonderful *degree of fidelity*, that they should *stick by a Prince who*, as he afterwards says, *hitherto had not deserv'd any thing amiss at their hands*; and who they were perswaded would always favour them. They had shewn *a great degree of fidelity* indeed, if they had stuck by him, when he turn'd against them, and began to oppose their interest. But the obligation was not great, that they did not forsake his interest first, and that they exerted themselves in his cause, when they might be thought to do it as much in opposition to those who had been the objects of their hatred and malice, as out of love to their Prince. But our Author goes on telling us: They *had rather undergo the uncertainties of a Popish government, than to suffer the English crown to be stain'd by the succession of an impure blood.* I make no doubt they were in great danger under a Popish government, as afterward plainly appear'd. But at that time they would not be perswaded, they were in any danger; but extoll'd the King in the most extravagant manner, commending him continually under the title of *James the Just*; and, which was strange, they flatter'd themselves he would make their Church more glorious than ever; and while they had such apprehensions, they deserv'd but little thanks for their being stiff on his side. *Neither did they think they could handsomly desert their natural Prince, who hitherto had not deserv'd any thing amiss at their hands.* Tho' they might think thus of him, yet I am perswaded whoever will impartially consider the accounts, which were publish'd of the Fire of *London*, and the Popish Plot, will not care to allow the truth of what our Author here says. But he had not as yet done any thing particularly against the Church of *England* to deserve ill at their hands; and so long as he persecuted none but the Dissenters, he could not be handsomly deserted.

Besides

Besides this, they were in good hopes that King James *would for the future administer the government by the same good methods, which he had hitherto given a specimen of: viz.* That he would protect the Church, and give them a full power of vexing and persecuting the Dissenters. *Very charitably presuming, that the natural generosity of this Prince might overcome the cruelty which his religion might put him upon.* They would do a piece of service to the memory of that Prince, who would acquaint the world with any acts of his generosity. The Dissenters especially know little of them hitherto; his Indulgence being granted with a design to serve his own cause, and not to favour them. But, if I mistake not the meaning of this passage, they *charitably presum'd* he would go on to favour them, and to oppress us, and therefore they were so zealous in his cause.

Our Author discourses very well concerning the inhuman cruelty practis'd against the followers of the Duke of *Monmouth*. But since he is pleas'd in another place to twit us with Sir *William Williams's being formerly our friend, and afterwards accusing the Bishops,* * for which we are no ways answerable, as I shall shew; I cannot but here desire the reader to observe, how he palliates a much more material objection of that nature against his own cause.

And first it was thought very advantageous to this end [of promoting the interest of the Papists] *to execute the laws with all possible severity against all who had engag'd in the Duke of* Monmouth's *insurrection* [and indeed many were then executed who had not been at all concern'd in it.] *and this without any regard either of age or sex. And, as the fittest person for this purpose, Sir* George Jefferies *is picked out, a great zealot (as he pretended) for the constitution of the Church of* England; *a Man of an uncommon confidence and fierce temper, the cruelty of whose nature, would do the Papists considerable service, in throwing all the odium of the design'd severity from themselves upon us.* †

I should be as well pleas'd as our Adversaries can be, if they could throw the odium of that and many other severities from themselves upon the Papists: but they really cannot. For not only Sir *George Jefferies,* but General

* *p.* 112. † *p.* 100.

neral *Kirk*, and abundance more of the canibals of the time, liv'd and died in the communion of the Church of *England*, without any eccleſiaſtical cenſure paſs'd upon them. And the Church of *England* made great uſe of Sir *George*'s aſſiſtance in accompliſhing their deſigns; ſuch as the condemnation of Mr. *Roſewel*, the fining and impriſoning Mr. *Baxter*, and many other of the like nature, which are ſo black one would be glad to forget them. And the Diſſenters ſuffer'd moſt grievouſly, not only by the means of *Jefferies* and *Kirk*, but of innumerable others, members of the Church of *England*, to the End of the year 1686.

Dr. *Nichols*, with very good reaſon, condemns the opinion of the eleven Judges of his own communion. * But if he had compar'd it with the famous *Oxford Decree*, he would have perceiv'd, that perſons of conſiderable note, both in the Univerſity and among the Clergy, had *laid the foundation of ſo hateful a tyranny* in the reign of King *Charles* II.

MDCLXXXVII. The King iſſued out at length his *Declaration* for liberty of conſcience, bearing date, *April* the 11. Dr. *Nichols* ſhews himſelf diſpleas'd with us, for making uſe of a liberty ſo granted. But ſince I have before had occaſion to anſwer the ſame objection, I ſhall paſs it over here; referring my reader to what I ſay about it, under the year 1671. After this, King *James* purſu'd his deſigns more openly, and invaded the rights and revenues of the Church of *England*; as may be ſeen in the Doctor's account. What the deſign was of giving a relation of theſe things, may be perceiv'd by what preſently follows it.

Moſt of the Nonconformiſts at the ſame time were ſo little affected with our ſad calamity, that during all that time, they held a fair correſpondence with our perſecutors, and were courting their favour.

This is not fair. For the act of one or two is not juſtly to be charg'd upon a party in general. And I queſtion, whether above one or two of our Miniſters were then much about the Court. And as Papiſts were then numerous there, it was not eaſy for them to avoid all manner of correſpondence with them; but that they courted the favour of ſuch (the King excepted) or that they were

I *intimate*

* *p.* 10. 102. † *p.* 105.

intimate with the Papists, as is said in the *Latin* edition, is what I never could see prov'd concerning those Ministers, whom I am vindicating. Mr. *Lob* had free access to King *James*, and endeavour'd to use what interest he had for the advantage of the Dissenters: wherein he seems to me to deserve much commendation, unless our Adversaries can tax him upon good evidence with any thing done amiss. Further, I shall afterwards prove from Bishop *Burnet*, that the Nonconformists were very much *affected with their sad calamity*. But for the present, let us put the case, that what our Author here asserts was true; and that the Dissenters were but *little*, nay, not at all *affected with their sad calamity*. With what face can the Churchmen reproach us for it? *The Churchmen*, I say, who were most intimate with Papists, in the reign of *Charles* I. when Archbishop *Laud*, and the rest of his faction earnestly courted the favour of a Popish Queen: who scandalously comply'd so long with the humours and designs of two Popish Kings, *Charles* and *James* II. who have all along not only held a fair correspondence, but kept up the greatest intimacy with Papists in chusing Parliament Men, in devising sham Plots to be thrown upon the Dissenters, and in framing and executing the severest laws against them: who, when our Ministers for twenty years together, and more, were turn'd out of their livings, their houses, out of cities, market and burrough towns; being accus'd by perjur'd informers, harrass'd and plunder'd by unrighteous Justices and Judges, and often kill'd with their nasty goals; who, I say, were then *so little affected with our sad calamity, that they not only held a fair correspondence with our persecutors*, but were themselves the men by whom we were persecuted. Besides, I would gladly be inform'd of what sort those were, who acted in King *James*'s Ecclesiastical Commission; whether they were Churchmen, or Dissenters? who were most numerous in his court, when at worst, Churchmen or Dissenters? Nay, don't we see to this very day, that none more heartily join interests than the Papists and High Churchmen? But behold another terrible accusation against us!

But in this great controversial war [with the Papists] *wherein our Divines fought so gallantly, the Ministers of the several Sects of the Dissenters were perfectly silent.* *

I

* *p.* 106.

I would not attempt to leſſen the glory of thoſe excellent writers againſt the Papiſts; eſpecially ſeeing they were ſo careful to ingroſs both the work and the glory of it. But they dont act fairly in blaming us, that we were then ſilent. They refus'd to accept the help we offer'd, tho' now they make ſuch an outcry againſt us for the want of it. Some of our ſide then wrote, tho' they did not, except it were by ſtealth, publiſh what they wrote, againſt the Papiſts. The Licencers of the Preſs being Churchmen, refus'd to allow the printing of any writings of the Nonconformiſts, meerly for the ſake of the authors, when they had nothing to object againſt the pieces themſelves. And the repulſe of ſome was a good reaſon why all others ſhould ſave themſelves the labour of writing to no purpoſe. So that if our Adverſaries will exerciſe their talent of cenſuring, they muſt level their cenſures at their own ſide, and not ours.

Nay if our Adverſaries had uſed no ſuch artifice, to ſecure to themſelves the intire glory of that triumph; yet they could have little cauſe to accuſe the Nonconformiſts for their ſilence. For to whom was it really owing, if they were then leſs prepar'd for ſuch an encounter? They were but juſt deliver'd from the Church's naſty goals, or crept out of the corners where they were before glad to hide themſelves: they were newly return'd to their families and ſtudies, from which the malice and cruelty of their enemies had long baniſh'd them. And when they had a little reſt, yet they could not well, in their circumſtances, be ſuppos'd to come to the controverſy with ſuch advantages, as the Churchmen; by whom they had been plunder'd of their books, or forc'd to ſell them either to prevent their being made a prey, or to raiſe money to maintain their diſtreſſed families.

Farther, if our Miniſters in complaiſance to the Court, neglected to aſſiſt them with their writings, how can they find fault with us upon that account? When our Miniſters were groaning under the heavieſt perſecution, the Churchmen could content themſelves to be ſilent, while they gap'd after the favour of the Court, *whoſe arts* they *began to ſmell out*. Or if a very few perſons were honeſt and bold enough to complain of the ſeverities we indur'd, and to exhort the Church to peace, they brought upon themſelves the diſpleaſure of the Clergy; who were ſure not to ſpare them for the ſake of their agreement with them

them in other things, but wrote as bitterly againſt them, as they uſe to do againſt us. But it ſhould ſeem, that our Adverſaries think 'tis very lawful for themſelves, tho' not for the Diſſenters, to be wholly at the devotion of the Court.

Again, I would be glad to know, who were in moſt danger of being ſeduc'd by the Papiſts; our people, or theirs? How few have gone ſtreight from us to the *Romaniſts*, without taking the Church of *England* in their way! The Papiſts always expect and reap a better harveſt of proſelytes from their people, than from ours, who they are ſenſible mortally hate their ſuperſtition. Upon this account therefore there was moſt reaſon for their writing in the Popiſh controverſy.

Laſtly, ſince many things, which are matters of controverſy between us and the Church of *England*, were retain'd by them with a deſign of pleaſing and winning the Papiſts; nothing can be more ſerviceable to our cauſe, than to have the Churchmen moſt thoroughly verſt in the Popiſh controverſy. For the further they go from them, the nearer they come to us: ſo that I would not have any envy them the honour, they ſo craftily appropriated to themſelves.

After this the King endeavour'd to get the *Teſt*, and penal laws taken away; as our Author relates that matter,* and then, according to his uſual manner, falls upon the poor Diſſenters.

Being mov'd with the unworthineſs of this compliance, I cannot chuſe but make a ſtop in the courſe of this running Hiſtory, which ſuffers me no where to ſtay, and to ſtand ſtill a little while in admiration. Could any one be ſo vile and mean ſpirited, as not to ſcorn and deſpiſe to be the tools of ſuch ſcandalous maſters? †

Could any one be ſo vile, do's he ſay? Yes, a great many of his own dear friends, who acted *under the direction of a Court, where all endeavours for accommodation were held for fanatical.* They were the men, who were *ſo vile and mean ſpirited, as not to ſcorn and deſpiſe to be the tools of ſuch ſcandalous maſters*, in making the penal laws againſt us. They were the men, who ſtir'd up two Popiſh Kings to perſecute us, and moſt readily executed their commands. Such

* *p.* 127. † *p.* 108.

Such *vile and mean ſpirited* creatures were the Churchmen, not only upon the Judges bench; but upon that of the Biſhops too, where *Hall, Watſon, Parker, Sprat,* &c. became *the tools of ſuch ſcandalous Maſters.* But let us hear him proceed in his declamation:

Could any one be ſo void of ſenſe, as to ſuffer himſelf to be impoſed upon by ſuch wretched arts, and by ſuch courſe flattery? Could any one be ſo profligately wicked, as when all our liberties and religion lay at ſtake, not only to give no aſſiſtance to reſcue them, but join their power in furthering the abominable deſign?

So *void of ſenſe,* and *ſo profligately wicked* could the Churchmen be, who fell in with a Popiſh deſign, not of repealing a law, thought to be ſcandalouſly wicked in its own nature, as is the caſe here put by our Author; but of giving up entirely the liberty of our country. The Epiſcopal Clergy have been ſo *profligately wicked,* as to aſſiſt the Papiſts in fathering upon us their feigned plots, and bruiting them abroad among the people to make us odious: they have had a great hand in plundering their Proteſtant neighbours, and ſo have weaken'd the intereſt of the Reformation here in *England.*

Why this action, however mad, however wicked, was done by great numbers of the Diſſenters, who not only did not hinder this horrid contrivance of the Papiſts, but encourag'd it by their intereſt, their advice, and their praiſes.

If they had done ſo, they had only follow'd the example the Churchmen had ſet them long before; and they had then done nothing in which they had not many Churchmen joining with them. But let Biſhop *Burnet* give an account how the Diſſenters then behav'd themſelves. He was as well acquainted as any man with the tranſactions of thoſe times; and about the latter end of this reign publiſh'd, *An Apology for the Church of* England, *with relation to the ſpirit of perſecution, for which ſhe is accus'd.* In which, after he had alledg'd many reaſons to prove the Church of *England* could never return to her old practice of perſecution, if ever ſhe got out of that ſtorm her ſelf; he adds what fully confutes the Doctor's ſuggeſtion: "And indeed if any argument were wanting "to compleat the certainty of this point, the wiſe and "generous behaviour of the main body of the Diſſenters, "in this preſent juncture, has given them ſo juſt a title "to our friendſhip; that we muſt reſolve to ſet all the "world

" world againſt us, if we can ever forget it, and if we do " not make them all the returns of eaſe and favour, when " 'tis in our power to do it.

This teſtimony is honourable; but the Doctor wrote ſometimes as if he car'd not what he ſaid againſt us; tho' the Tranſlation in this paſſage is not ſo bad as the Original.

While many of our Miniſters in the Univerſity and elſewhere, for ſtanding up for the common liberty, were thrown out of their preferments, and forc'd to live at other mens tables; ſeveral of their Paſtors live in ſplendor about the Court, poſſeſſing the ear of the Prince, and adviſing him how he might obtain the repeal of thoſe laws, whereupon depended all our hopes of preſerving the Proteſtant religion among us. Mr. Lob, *a Presbyterian* [rather an Independent] *Miniſter, and Mr.* Penn, *the chief of the Quakers, were ſo great counſellors and favourites of the King, that thoſe who would requeſt any favour of the crown, or beg off any penalty, would make uſe of their intereſt to obtain their deſire.*[*]

A very ſmall and inconſiderable number of their Miniſters were then turn'd out, I am ſure it is ſo, if compar'd with the number of our Miniſters turn'd out in 1662. But *ſeveral of our Paſtors liv'd in ſplendour about the Court.* And if they did, our Adverſaries need not envy them; conſidering they had been then turn'd out of their livings above twenty years, and forc'd to live mean enough all that time. But who were theſe Miniſters about the Court? Mr. *Lob* is a ſingle inſtance: and when the Doctor adds Mr. *Pen* the Quaker, with whom we were no way concern'd, it looks as if he could not find any more of our Miniſters about the Court. And out of their Biſhops, who are but few in number, I could name ſeveral who fell in with the Court, while our Author can name but one of our Miniſters, who are ſo much more numerous. But if any man will conſider what the behaviour of the Churchmen uſes to be in hanging on the Court, he will ſee our Author could have little reaſon to blame our Miniſters, if more of them had then join'd with Mr. *Lob* in attending upon it. And if Mr. *Lob's* teſtimony may be taken, I have heard him declare, that the Churchmen made baſe offers enough to King *James*, when

[*] *Pag.* 109.

when he first began to pretend to favour the Dissenters.

But perhaps he was among those who *advis'd* the King, how he might obtain the *repeal of the laws* refer'd to by our Author. And 'tis indeed true: His opinion was, that the *Test Act* ought to be repeal'd by the Parliament, and that it might be done at that time with safety. Nor did he want plausible reasons to support his opinion. The law itself seem'd to him not only unjust, with reference to many Dissenters; but to give occasion also to the abominable profanation of one of the most sacred institutions of our holy religion, while the vilest debauchees were oblig'd to take the Sacrament. Several were of Mr. *Lob*'s opinion, that a law they apprehended so opposite both to justice and piety ought to be repeal'd the first opportunity; and that every one should contribute what he could toward the repealing it. Nay, altho' the taking away the *Test* might seem dangerous to politicians; yet certainly, if the first enacting the law was a grevious offence against God, they could not be innocent, who neglected to abrogate it, when it was in their power. For we are *not to do evil, that good may come of it.* Further, tho' Mr. *Lob* knew very well King *James*'s religion was the worst in the world; yet he thought he did not dissemble in the profession he made of his designs. And therefore as the King made large promises of an equal security for our religion, in case the *Test* were repeal'd; Mr. *Lob* too easily believ'd him, as experience has convinc'd us. But if Mr. *Lob* was rather in a mistake than in a fault; yet the main body of the Dissenters took other measures, as I have already shewn from Bishop *Burnet.* But there is no end of our Adversaries cavilling; and so here follows another sad charge against our Laity.

Now the Lay Nonconformists from all parts of the nation send up Addresses to the King, sign'd with their own hands, full of the most submissive flattery, &c.

'Tis natural enough to all men to be complaisant and obliging to such as shew kindness to them. Our Princes have had experience of this in the Church of *England,* who have complemented them with as *submissive* a *flattery,* as ever the Dissenters did. They not only set the Dissenters an example, by their mean cringing to the two Popish Brothers; but in the last reign, after they had severely reflected upon our side, for what was done in King *James*'s time; they,

in

in defiance to all modesty, renew'd their old practice in presenting scandalous Addresses, stuff'd with fulsom flattery, and promises of unreserv'd obedience; and that at a time when the nation seems to have been in as much danger as ever.

Indeed the Dissenters are easy to be won upon by Kindness, as the Churchmen themselves have reason to acknowledge; and would have had much more, if they could have ever found in their hearts to have acted friendly toward them, when they were not themselves in any distress.

And what if some of our Laity, who dwelt in villages, earning their living with daily hard labour, and having little skill in the laws of their country, when they found themselves deliver'd from a cruel and tedious persecution by their Prince, who, as they thought, design'd them nothing but kindness herein; what if such men, I say, in these circumstances were transported with a liberty so unexpectedly granted, and were unwary and excessive in expressing their acknowledgments to their deliverer; and, being deceiv'd by some specious pretences, promis'd too much subjection? Is this such a crime as is never to be forgiven? We are men, and so not exempted from the common infirmity of mankind, a liableness to mistake. Our Author owns his side have sometimes, and I have prov'd they have often, been in the wrong. And they who expect pardon from others, ought not to be backward in granting it themselves.

There was no great reason why our Author, in giving an account of the trial of the Seven Bishops, should twit the Dissenters with Sir *William Williams* being *formerly their great friend.* He is said to have been a Churchman, and if as a Lawyer, he was sometimes imploy'd by Dissenters, and for his own gain pleaded any of our causes; are we answerable for his appearing in any other causes, and his serving other kind of clients? If this is matter of reproach to and beside the man himself, all impartial Judges will think 'tis much more so to the Church, for receiving him as a member of her communion, than to us for retaining him as a Counsel.

After the Parliament had given the crown MDCLXXXVIII.
to the Prince and Princess of *Orange*, the Dissenting Ministers attended them, in a body with their Addresses. The Bishops in their Petition to King *James*, had

had declar'd themſelves ready to *come to a temper towards Diſſenters:** and therefore the Miniſters now deſir'd their Majeſties K. *William* and Q. *Mary*, in the Addreſſes they preſented, to compoſe our differences, and eſtabliſh a firm union among us, and profeſs'd their own readineſs to embrace juſt terms of union. Their Majeſties were pleas'd readily to undertake the deſirable work; and ſoon after Commiſſioners were appointed, as our Author tells us,† "'Tis true it did not ſucceed," *ſays Biſhop Burnet*, "a formed reſolution of conſenting to no altera-"tions at all, in order to that union, made that the at-"tempt was laid aſide."‖

Dr. *Nichols* makes ſome very honeſt and handſom reflections upon the occaſion of mentioning the *Act* of *Toleration*. However he ſeems to me not to come off very well in the concluſion of his diſcourſe upon that head.

Many, ſays he, *have thought this Toleration too extenſive; but it was ſuch as the then preſent ſtate of the commonwealth would bear.*

'Tis indeed true, that the High Church bigots have thought it *too extenſive*; and therefore ſet themſelves to cramp it in the late reign; and in all probability, had not a merciful God cut ſhort their deſigns, they would have made it narrow enough in a little time; for they would probably have left nothing of it. But if things are fairly conſider'd, and men form their notions according to that exact rule: *Whatſoever ye would that others ſhould do to you, do ye the ſame to them*; we muſt allow that *Toleration*, even before it was curtail'd in the laſt reign, was not extenſive enough. Nor can I ſee any reaſon, why an abſolute liberty in matters of religion ſhould not be granted to all good ſubjects. Particularly, what good has been done by the *Toleration*'s not being extended to the *Socinians*, as our Author takes notice it is not? If they have been a ſmall matter fewer in number upon this account, that advantage has been perhaps out weigh'd by a contrary miſchief. For while they have not been allow'd to keep up ſuch a religion as they approve, they have run into Deiſm, and a neglect and contempt of all public worſhip, and many other inconveniences.

'Tis

* P. III. † *Pag.* 117. ‖ Reflections on a Book intitul'd, *The Rights*, &c. *of a Convoc.* P. 16.

'Tis great pity Dr. *Tillotſon* ſhould ever have been a means of hindering the *Bill of Comprehension* from paſſing in Parliament, by propoſing, that the Convocation ſhould firſt conſider that matter.* No terms of union are ever to be expected from a Convocation: it were therefore to be wiſh'd, our Parliament would once more undertake the work of compoſing our differences: they are much more likely to heal us, than the Clergy.

'Twould alſo be a good piece of ſervice, if the Biſhops, or ſome of the Commiſſioners before mention'd, would oblige the world with an account of what they agreed upon; that ſo it might be read on both ſides, and we might know how far they are willing to yield to us, and be able to acquaint them how well thoſe alterations would pleaſe us.

After our Author has finiſh'd his account of the proceedings of the Commiſſioners, which very well deſerves reading; he runs out into a long diſcourſe, concerning the diſputes which have been among themſelves in Convocation. Herein our controverſy with them is little concern'd; unleſs, as many have thought, they were deſignedly ſet on foot and kept up by the High Church Clergy, for fear leſt they ſhould ſeem to have leiſure or temper enough, to have the work of Pacification afreſh recommended to their conſideration, and ſo it ſhould at length be accompliſh'd. This is evident, that they, who have been moſt backward to agree with us, have been forward enough to raiſe a ſquabble in their own Church about trifles; tho at the ſame time they expos'd themſelves to the ſcorn and contempt of wiſe and prudent men. I therefore paſs over theſe things; and come to what our Author ſays when he has done with them.

And now let all the Chriſtian world be judge, whether we have not to the utmoſt of our power endeavour'd to find out a method, to have the unhappy controverſies between us and the Nonconformiſts compromis'd: † When I came to this paſſage, I thought the Doctor was juſt concluding his Introduction. But ſome things happening to his purpoſe after he ſeems to have written ſo far, he thought fit to add them. By which one would gueſs he follow'd *Horace*'s advice, and this work was not leſs than nine years in poliſhing. As to what he here ſays, I may well affirm concerning our ſide, what he do's concerning his own. Nor need we fear the judgment of the whole

* *Pag.* 116. † *p.* 133.

Christian world. Let any fair and competent judge now speak his mind, whether we have ever been wanting in endeavours after peace. Let him say, whether the guilt of the Schism do's not lie at the door of those, who insist upon, or submit to, those rigid terms, which the Papists devis'd for the breaking us in pieces; rather than at ours, who cannot with safe consciences comply with them. We are not in our Separation led by a concern for our own honour; we only desire to worship God according as he has appointed. 'Tis to no purpose for him to insinuate the charge of the contrary, as he do's in his following words: *which tho we have not had the good luck to obtain, yet certainly they stand oblig'd to retain a grateful memory for our good intention on their behalf; and that laying aside all punctilios of honour, they should make all the paces they can towards a union with us.* This is a great mistake: we stand upon no such *punctilios*, as I have prov'd our Adversaries have often done. Nor is the mistake less in the condition here infer'd. For if the present terms of agreement are sinful, they ought to be alter'd, the Churchmen themselves being judges. There is therefore most reason they should come over to us, not only *laying aside all punctilios of honour*; but, which is much more, not regarding their preferments and secular advantages. But let us hear how our Author proceeds:

For a great many of us have for the sake of them lost the good will of many of our dear Brethren of our own Church, with whom we held formerly the strictest friendship and familiarity. And therefore they cannot make a sufficient return for so great a kindness, but only by embracing our communion, who have endeavour'd to purchase their fellowship at so great an expence. *

We readily own there have been formerly many, and are now some few among them, earnestly desirous of an accommodation, of whose friendship we shall always retain a graceful remembrance. We are satisfy'd, they were troubled when they saw our Ministers ejected, plunder'd, imprison'd, and in a variety of methods miserably persecuted. We gratefully acknowledg'd, they were sometimes a considerable comfort and shelter to the distressed: and we highly reverence them for their pious endeavours to compose our differences. And as we have always pursued the same design, we chearfully accept their friendship and brotherly

* *Pag.* 134.

therly love. Whatever therefore has been, or may hereafter be said concerning the Churchmen, as the causes of all our calamities, we desire may be understood for the most part of those furious High Church Priests, who are so implacable against us, as to hate all those of their own Church, who shew any moderation or tenderness towards us. And since these have always been, and are now especially, the vastly greater number: and the Low Church, who desire peace, have never been able to obtain the least concession in our favour, but the state of our controversy is rather worse than better: we hope we shall be excus'd in chusing rather to follow the dictates of our consciences, for the sake of which we have already endur'd so great sufferings; than to embrace that peace, which our Author recommends. And truly, if those turbulent Ecclesiastics, Dr. *Nichols* refers to in this Paragraph, who have always declar'd themselves enemies to peace, are not Schismatics; what is it we must call by the name of Schism? Let then *the whole Christian world judge*, whether the moderate and peaceable Churchmen should not alter their measures; forsaking the communion of Schismatics, and come over to us; rather than urge us to go over to them. I will add further, that if men were to judge of the great kindness of the more peaceable sort of Churchmen by the treatment the Doctor, who puts himself among them, gives us in this his Defence; they would see little reason to conclude we were under any great obligations to them. But I must own, I think he was not of the most moderate sort.

These matters however piously design'd by good persons, were prevented by the cross attempts of peevish men. I make no doubt of the truth of this. But then I assert, it was by *peevish men* of his own side, as I have prov'd by Bishop *Burnet*, and he has evidenc'd himself. I deny it was prevented by any on our side, tho he charges us with it in the next words: *For during all that time, that our thoughts were busy in bringing about an union with the Dissenters, some hot men of their party did not forbear to irritate our Church by several severe words and actions in opposition to it.* I wonder why these men are not particularly mention'd. What follows concerning Sir *Humfrey Edwin*, and the Answer to Mr. *Burscough* happen'd a long time after these designs of an accommodation were laid aside; and therefore could not be any hindrance to them, or means to *prevent* them. And what signify'd the attempts of any hot

and obscure persons (if any such had really attempted any thing at that time) since the Dissenters testify'd publicly in a body their desire of an accommodation, when they addres's'd the King and Queen?

Sir Humfrey Edwin, *late Lord Mayor of the City of* London, *a Member of one of the Dissenting congregations (but to qualifie himself for so advantageous a post, joining himself sometimes to our communion) to the great dishonour of the laws and the chief Magistracy of that city, went publicly to a Conventicle, which was held in a Hall, belonging to one of the mean mechanical Companies in that city, attended with all the ensigns of that august corporation.**

I shall have a more proper occasion to treat of *Occasional Conformity* afterwards, and therefore wave it here. † I would now gladly learn, what law then in being this action of Sir *Humfrey* dishonour'd. By our laws a *Lord Mayor* was as free to chuse his religion, as any of the inferior people. Nor was he forbid to attend our worship with the *ensigns* of his office. And how was it *to the dishonour of the chief magistracy of that city?* If the laws permit the Lord Mayor to frequent our assemblies; why might he not carry those *ensigns* with him? Would he not be a greater dishonour to our laws, if they allow'd him to appear himself in any place, where it would be scandalous for those badges of his honour to be seen? But one would think the Church looks upon those fine things as her property; or supposes they have been hallow'd by some Bishop, and so were profan'd by being carry'd into any place of worship, not first consecrated by one of that order. But what so great holiness belongs to them, that they cannot without a profanation be carry'd into a religious protestant assembly; since without any scruple, they are continually carried about in more profane places; I mean in the common streets? But *he went publicly to a Conventicle* thus attended. 'Tis not my business to render railing for railing; but yet I would admonish our Adversaries to consider, that when with such disgraceful names they defame religious assemblies, which are contrary to no laws, they affront the laws both of God and man: the laws of God, in reviling assemblies form'd according to the rule of God's Word, without the vain inventions of men; the laws of men, since those assemblies are allow'd by act of Parliament with a penalty upon the disturbers of them.

* *Pag.* 35. † *Pag.* 383.

them. But 'tis common with some men, to endeavour to confute their adversaries with reproaches, for lack of solid arguments. But since the Churches of the primitive Christians went by this disgraceful name among the Pagans, as *Arnobius* and *Lactantius* testify, we can patiently bear this reproach.* Well, but that *Conventicle was held in a Hall belonging to one of the mean mechanical Companies in that city.* And why must those Companies be spoken of with so much contempt? It do's not look well for our Adversaries to shew a malignity against men, for letting us the places of our worship; because this looks as tho they are displeas'd we have any, and envy'd us our liberty. And is there not an inconsistency in this period? How can he call the city an *august Corporation*; if he looks upon the several societies that constitute it to be *mean mechanical Companies?* I am sorry to observe, our Clergymen frequently appear so little friends to the trading part of the nation, that they can hardly speak of them without contempt. But as to the thing it self: What if the assembly was held in such a place? What law of God has ever forbid men to worship him in any places, where men use to meet upon the account of their trade or merchandize? Where do's the Scripture teach us the unlawfulness of worshiping God any where, but in places set apart from all common uses for divine worship? And what greater harm is there in our worshiping God in such places; than there was in the antientest Christians meeting in *the School of Tyrannus*, † or any houses, or fields, which they found convenient? Or where have they any precept, that places of worship must be consecrated by a Bishop? Or by what argument can they prove any greater holiness belongs to their places of worship, than ours? For tho I dont reckon the controversy much concern'd in the observation; yet I can tell those who delight in talking after this rate, that the place, whither Sir *Humfrey Edwin* carry'd the Mace, was as handsome as many of their own parish Churches; and was indeed apply'd to no other use but that of the worship of God, no use being made of it by the Company which granted the lease of it. But men often wound their own credit, when at all adventures they endeavour to disparage their neighbours. Our Author proceeds thus concerning this business:

* Arn *Lib.* 4. Lact. *Inst. Lib.* 5 c. 11. De Mort. Persec. c. 15 34. 36. 48.
† Acts xix. 9.

This bold action was defended in print by some of his friends: who had no hard task to manage; for as yet we have heard nothing against it, but a bitter, sorry declamation: *this confident reason being among others alledg'd, that their religion was as much establish'd by law as ours is,* viz. *by the Act of Toleration which was lately passed, and by which they are permitted to exercise their own way of worship without incurring the penalties of the laws.* The religion which any one may freely possess, and in the practice of which all are secur'd and protected by the laws of the land, may properly enough be said to be establish'd. And thus ours is *as much*, that is, *as truly* establish'd as theirs. They who talk after this rate seem to think, that religion only can be said to be establish'd, which is favour'd by the state with the greatest privileges and secular advantages. Which is just as tho' a man should say: The woolen manufacture is the only one establish'd in *England*; because greater privileges are granted to it, than any of the rest. I acknowledge the Church of *England* was formerly the only religion establish'd by law. But when the old severe laws against us were repeal'd, and a new one was enacted, that left every one to his own judgment in the choice of his religion; how can our religion be said not to be establish'd? Our Adversaries would gladly have people think the preceptive part of those old persecuting laws still continues, and that the penalty only is taken off. But what sort of law must we understand that to be, which has no sanction added to it? Must we apprehend our law makers, as requiring us to do somewhat, which they let us know we may neglect without any offence? And is not this a very weighty controversy? Do's it not deserve to have all our Brethren abroad call'd in to the decision of it? Oh men of *Israel*, come in from all quarters, and help the distressed! Whose sorrowful case is since the first starting of this controversy become much worse. For ever since the two kingdoms were united, the Presbyterian religion has been an establish'd and national religion in *Great Britain*, in the same sense in which the Episcopal is so. Nay, in some sense 'tis more establish'd than the Episcopal; in as much as the Episcopal may be alter'd by the Parliament, whereas the Presbyterian in *Scotland* cannot according to the Articles of Union. Tho it must be own'd, High Church did notwithstanding break in upon them, and had as much regard to public faith with

them

them, as with the poor *Catalonians*, and the rest of our Allies, whom they most perfidiously betray'd, making themselves an abhorrence to God and all the world.

After this came out a Book set forth by way of Letter, subscrib'd, as the furious author thereof pretends, tho without names, by all the Nonconformists, against Mr. Robert Burscoe, *who had written a learned Treatise against Schism.*

Mr. *Burscough* had written against the Dissenting Laity, and accordingly the author, whoever he was, return'd an answer to him in a Letter, setting forth what the Dissenting Laity had to say for themselves; but he never pretended his Letter was *subscrib'd by all the Nonconformists*, and especially *subscrib'd without names*, which is an odd way enough of subscribing. One may here see what the spirit of a party will do: for Mr. *Burscough*, whom our Author so much extols, wrote with the greatest bitterness and raillery, if his Answerer fairly represents him: "That "our Dissenting is worse than murder or idolatry, and "equal to the crucifying the Son of God: that we "have cut our selves off from the catholic Church, and "from Christ the head of it:" * with a great deal more to the like purpose. And yet this author's Treatise has no other character given of it, but that it was a *learned* one; when on the other hand the writer of the Answer to it, which, for ought I have seen, is very modest, is term'd a furious author, and the Book it self thus describ'd: *This Book was replenish'd with so many virulent calumnies against the Church of* England, *that no railing writer ever fill'd his papers with so many malicious invectives against any private adversary, much less against so renown'd a Church.* But Mr. *Burscough* had fill'd his papers with more malicious invectives against us, without any provocation on our part. Nay, I might well say, that not only the Dissenters, but the Foreign Protestants are worse treated in several parts of this *Defence* of the Doctor; than the Church men are in any part I have observed of that Answer, so much condemn'd by him. But he descends to particulars. *He accuses*, says he, *the Lives of our Ministers, as worse than those of Pagans:* † This passage is represented more severe than 'tis in the Author, who only says: "'Tis lamentably too true of very many, not "only of the common members, but of the teachers and "leaders of the Church, that they have little else to

* *p.* 104, 105. † *p.* 136.

" distinguish them from Heathens, or to persuade a belief " of their Christianity, but an empty name, and a blind " zeal for what they call the *Church.*" * In two things our Author misrepresents that writer: in making him speak of their Ministers in general, when he only says *very many of them*; and in making him say that their lives were *worse*, when he only affirms them to be as *bad* as those of Pagans. And tho neither of these is fair in any author, yet I will venture to say, the latter misrepresentation can't be any great injury to the writer of the Answer. For if he had said what is pretended, there are a *very great many* Clergymen who take care to make his words good. There have been many Heathens, who would have blush'd at the looseness, debauchery and perjury, with which the whole nation is sensible they are chargeable? *profanely scoffing at the absolution and discipline of Penance used in our Church:* I know not how the same mistake I had complain'd of in the *Latin* edition is repeated in the *English*, in setting down the Page whence this is pretended to be cited. I look'd again for the passage, but could not find it. But who can wonder, if a person treated their Absolution and Penance with some kind of scorn, since they themselves have in effect made a jest of it; practising it only upon the poor, and using it as a trick to get a good *round sum of money* from the rich. † He goes on: *calling the prayer which we use in the administration of the Sacrament, at the delivery of the Elements a charm.* This passage is also falsely quoted, but I chanc'd to hit upon it. Mr. *Burscough* had said the Elements were deliver'd to the people with a prayer, and therefore were to be receiv'd kneeling. The Prayer is: *The body of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was given for thee, preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life. Take and eat this in remembrance that Christ died for thee, and feed on him in thy heart by faith with thanksgiving.* The like, with a small variation, at the delivery of the Cup: " To " which, *says the author of the Letter*, we answer: This, " which you call a *prayer*, sounds more like a *priestly benediction*, or a kind of *exorcism*, being repeated over and " over to every individual communicant." ‖ The Translator has not mistaken his meaning, when he put *charm* instead of *exorcism*. And really I don't see how that can be

* *p.* 5. † *See Dr.* Nicholls, *p.* 350. ‖ *p.* 89.

be call'd a prayer, since the Minister speaks not to God, but the communicant.

What is refer'd to concerning their Sermons, is not right quoted in the Margin. I suppose he may find fault with some of their Preachers, who stuff their Sermons perpetually with the most bitter invectives, and preach very little to the edification of their hearers. And with very good reason may vicious Ministers be call'd *wolves*, and the slothful be compar'd to *drones*, nor is there any railery or calumny in using such language concerning them.

And now we are come to the reign of Queen *Anne*, who, as long as she follow'd the counsels and example of her glorious Predecessor, was favour'd by God with the most remarkable and astonishing victories and triumphs, and shin'd with a glory superior to all her predecessors, or contemporary princes; courted and belov'd of all, as the guardian of the liberties of *Europe*, the defender of the oppressed, and the scourge of tyrants. But abandoning her self at last to the direction of High Church Politicians, she sacrific'd the nation's and religion's honour and safety together with her own; and having liv'd to see her self slighted of her old and faithful Allies, trick'd by her new friends, and miserably embarrass'd by her darling counsellors, she died unlamented of all, who were not in a French interest, and enemies to the liberties of *Europe*. MDCCI.

In the beginning of her reign Mr. *Edmund Calamy*, (now made Doctor of Divinity) wrote the *Abridgement of Mr.* Baxter's *Life*. Our Authors owns him to be a *learned Divine*;* and his Book contain'd a very good History of our nation, and especially with respect to our controversy, for about fifty years; out of which several things are taken into this Historical account I have been giving of our troubles.

The IX and X Chapters of that *Abridgement* were more especially displeasing to our Adversaries. In the former he gives a Catalogue of the Ministers turn'd out in 1662, adding some account of their lives, and the works they publish'd; whereby he has preserved the memory of those glorious Confessors, who will be more valu'd by impartial posterity. Our Adversaries were griev'd the base actions of their predecessors should be so brought to light. But as Dr. *Calamy* faithfully related these historal matters,

* *p.* 137.

ters, as he found them, they gave him no trouble about that Chapter, but contented themſelves with beſtowing on him occaſionally ſome general remarks in their writings. In the other Chapter he collects the arguments, by which the ejected Miniſters defended themſelves. Theſe he digeſts into a good order, and delivers them very conciſely. In this Chapter alſo he acted only the part of an Hiſtorian, delivering other mens arguments rather than his own.

'Tis not eaſy to ſay which Chapter diſguſted them moſt; but ſince this latter Chapter conſiſted of arguments (tho only hiſtorically related) they thought they had a fair handle for contention, and ſo they eagerly attack'd him.

Among the reſt, two learned and moderate Conformiſts, Mr. *Ollyfe*, and Mr. *Hoadly*, the preſent very worthy Biſhop of *Bangor*, wrote againſt him. It happen'd, as is very uſual with our Adverſaries, that theſe two defended Conformity upon different principles. Dr. *Calamy* therefore in his Anſwer ſet their arguments one againſt another, and ſo handſomly defended our cauſe (whatever Dr. *Nichols* talks of a *perfect conqueſt obtain'd over him*) that the Diſſenters look'd upon themſelves oblig'd not only to the Doctor for his Defence, but to his Antagoniſts, who gave him the occaſion of writing.

And neither the Biſhop, nor Mr. *Ollyfe* pleas'd the High Clergy by their writings. Theſe moderate men endeavour'd all they could to put a mild ſenſe upon the terms of Conformity, and blam'd the Diſſenters for the rigid meaning in which they took them; whereas the High Clergy ſay we underſtand the terms right, and they ſhould be defended in that ſenſe of them. They may pleaſe to diſpute that matter among themſelves. As for our parts, we pay a great deference to the learning and good temper of thoſe two writers; and only wiſh they had been concern'd in the defence of a better cauſe.

The account our Author gives of a Book, which came out *under a counterfeit Title*, is not much amiſs. But ſince he has omitted it, I think it proper to give a brief account of the occaſion and deſign of that Pamphlet. The High Churchmen, who had taken the oaths to King *William*, always hated him, as bred among the Presbyterians, and a friend to them. They did not much diſſemble their ſentiments during the King's life; but no ſooner was he dead,

but

but they openly proclaim'd and gloried in them. They concluded then, they had an opportunity put into their hands of treading down the poor Diſſenters, and ſatiating their revenge upon them. They preach'd therefore the bittereſt ſermons againſt them, that malice could help them to invent; and did not fail to charge them with whatever would incenſe the Queen and Parliament againſt them. The very raſcally mob, following the example of ſuch leaders, often inſulted our Miniſters in the open ſtreets. Theſe things we bore with meekneſs, as became Chriſtians. But one of the Laity, taking notice of the Churchmens behaviour, reſolv'd to deſcribe their diſpoſition in this cunning manner. Whatever was inſtill'd daily into the people by the bitterer ſort of Eccleſiaſtics in their Sermons and Pamphlets he collected into a ſhort Treatiſe, and ſo in that diſguiſe of a High Church Man publiſh'd their true ſenſe to the world. Nor did he ſay any thing more ſharp and ſevere, than what the *Oxonians* had done in ſome of their printed Sermons, which breath'd nothing but blood and ſlaughter. The writer of that Pamphlet ſoon after ſuffer'd for his cunning, but, I confeſs, not very honourable ſtratagem; wherein I am ſatisfied he had not the advice of any of our Miniſters.

In the next place our Author treats of *Occaſional Communion*. * Of the thing it ſelf I ſhall give this following brief account. After the Church of *England*, being led by a Schiſmatical rage, had ejected our Miniſters, the Diſſenters were divided in their opinion about the buſineſs of holding Communion with the pariſh Churches; which cannot ſeem ſtrange to any one who conſiders how many were ejected. Some thought that communion was to be ſhun'd, as utterly unlawful; others, tho they thought it their duty to adhere to the Miniſters, becauſe they were unjuſtly turn'd out, and look'd upon all the Conformiſts as Schiſmatics, yet apprehended they were not to diſown them as tho they were not Chriſtian Brethren; and judg'd they might innocently ſometimes attend their worſhip, provided they did not forſake their rightful Paſtors, nor offer any violence to their own conſciences. Being thus perſuaded, they went ſometimes to the pariſh Churches, and receiv'd the Sacrament according to the cuſtom of the Church of *England*. For they thought the

* *p.* 138.

the receiving the Lord's Supper kneeling was not in it self unlawful; tho they utterly dislike the rigid imposition of that posture, which they saw drove some pious men from the ordinance.

Whether they were in the right, and the gesture was lawful or not, I will not give my own opinion. This, as I said, was theirs, and so they did not against the dictates of their own consciences. They who thought it lawful to receive the Sacrament in that manner, endeavour'd to keep that temper prescrib'd by the Apostle: *Let not him that eateth, despise him that eateth not; and let not him that eateth not, judge him that eateth, for God hath receiv'd him.** And indeed why should we condemn a Christian Brother, when he do's that in which his own conscience is satisfied? Many therefore of our Ministers, who thought the posture was unlawful, or at least doubtful, left their people to follow their own judgment in this matter. In which I think they were not much to be discommended.

This was now the practice of many Dissenters, before ever there was any thought of the *Test*. Nor did the Parliament ever design by the *Test Act* to guard against the Dissenters, but only against the Papists; however the Act has been since basely turn'd against them. For tho' 'tis true, those who first devis'd the Act, used not to attend our assemblies; yet 'tis well known they were favourers of the Dissenters, and friends to our civil liberties. The Law it self has been censur'd both by Dissenters and Churchmen, as unjust and ungodly: and if our Adversaries had any regard to the honour of Christianity, they would long ago have earnestly solicited the repeal of it. But as soon as Queen *Anne* came to the throne, a set of profligate men openly testify'd their inclination to persecute the Dissenters, and kindle a flame in the nation: they brought in therefore this Bill, whereby the *Test* Act would have been made more severe and rigorous than it was before, and the Dissenters have been caught in the Church's snare; so that whether they excepted, or whether they refus'd an office, they might be wiped of *a good round sum of Money*. God was pleas'd at that time to disappoint their wicked devices, and make their enterprize disserviceable to the High Church cause. However afterwards (towards the latter end of that reign) when he suffer'd

* Rom. xiv. 3.

suffer'd them to be a plague to all *Europe*, they were permitted to wreck their malice upon the Dissenters by that Act.

'Tis not true that *the Lords unanimously agreed in condemning this practice.* Some of them indeed dislik'd it; but every one knows, several of them were of another mind, and utterly dislik'd and rejected the Bill. And since our moderation has been such an offence, not only to the furious bigots of the Church; but to such pretended, with Dr. *Nichols*, to be of a better temper, and they have shewn themselves not displeas'd with our being oppress'd; let all our Brethren thro' the whole world be Judges, whether we have not good reason utterly to forsake the tents of these men, and keep at the greatest distance from their Communion. Dr. *Nichols* is pleas'd to commend the Presbyterians for their *entertaining a good opinion* of the Church, and departing from *the enmity of their predecessors* against it.* And yet in this place he calls our moderation toward them a *scandalous practice.*† The Presbyterians who had always exceeded in their charity toward the Church, and were chiefly the persons who allow'd an occasional communion, were most struck at by that Act. So that the nearer any come to them, and the less they shew a dislike of them, the more they are despis'd, condemn'd, and bitterly reproach'd by them. And tho our moderation towards them, has been perhaps our greatest crime; yet they of all men are the unfittest to blame us, and use us so despitefully, as they have done, for it. But perhaps God saw they were the propereſt instruments to bring us to a sight of our charitable errour and mistake.

And now I may well say with our Author: *Let any one judge*, whether the blame of our differences do's not ly at the door of the Episcopal party alone?‖ We have all along desir'd peace, and will still most chearfully embrace it, as soon as the unrighteous conditions, which now obstruct it, are remov'd. But if no alteration can be made in the terms, there is an end of all hope of peace and concord. For we had rather obey God, than man; nor will we ever venture to wrong our consciences, let who will be the advisers. We have frequently testify'd our desire of a *Comprehension*, as the way to heal us. If our Adversaries are still averse to it, they have our consent, that they

* *p.* 145. † *p.* 138. ‖ *Pag.* 140.

they ſhould keep their admir'd Liturgy, Diſcipline and Ceremonies to themſelves. However we are ſorry for their obſtinacy, and admoniſh them to be quiet, and forebear to provoke us with their outrageous diſcourſes in the pulpit and the preſs. If they will hearken to this admonition, it may not perhaps be impoſſible that the anger of High Church Eccleſiaſtics may cool in time, and they come to ſome temper; and ſo that great work may be accompliſh'd which all good men have hitherto in vain long'd for.

But ſince it has pleas'd our adverſaries to appeal to our Brethren abroad, the regard I have to their reputation obliges me to add a word to them. You, my Brethren, are now choſen Arbitrators, and your judgment concerning our controverſy is deſir'd by our Adverſaries. But there is a ſnake in the graſs. For if your judgment ſhould vary a hair's breadth from theirs, they will make the world ring with their clamours. Believe me, the whole company will reproach you, juſt as Dr. *Nichols* do's Mr. *Calvin*, with a *too officious offer of your ſervice.** Nay, they will eaſily condemn this appeal of the Doctor, as the too *officious* undertaking of a private perſon, acting without any ſufficient warrant from his ſuperiors. That you may not therefore loſe your labour, 'tis adviſeable you ſhould, before you give judgment, have ſome good aſſurance, that our Adverſaries will pay a regard to it. If they will leave the determination of our controverſies to you, we make no queſtion of a good iſſue. But your buſineſs is to take good heed, how you concern your ſelves with ſuch kind of men, unleſs you can digeſt all their impertinences. For you may learn by this our Author, what their temper and deſign is. He deſpiſes the Liturgies of the Foreign Churches, the more to cry up and recommend that of the Church of *England*.† This is alſo the deſign of that *General Council of Proteſtants* which the Doctor deſir'd, *viz.* That by their aſſiſtance, the *Engliſh* Liturgy, Diſcipline and Ceremonies might be brought into the Churches abroad.‖ Nor will they be ever ſatisfy'd with any Conceſſions, ſo long as you don't fall in with all their opinions, and conform your Churches to their Model.

A famous inſtance of this nature we have in the Church of *Scotland*, in the reign of King *James* I. which I have already mention'd: and many others of the like

* *p.* 16. † 20. 21. 150. ‖ *p.* 149.

like nature might be alledg'd. Thus in the reign of King *Charles* I. a Liturgy like the *Englifh*, but with the addition of ſome other ſuperſtitions, which the *Engliſh* Clergy have been hankering after, was obtruded upon the Church of *Scotland*. And how many and dreadful were the troubles occaſion'd thereby!

The *Scots* afterward ſhook off the heavy yoke of the Hierarchy, which both they and King *Charles* II. moſt ſolemnly abjur'd; and yet no ſooner was he ſettled in his throne, than he again ſet up that government, without doubt by the advice of our *Engliſh* Biſhops; and by blood and ſlaughter he eſtabliſh'd it among them. Nor did the Papiſts themſelves, when they had the power in their hands, exceed the Epiſcopal party at that time in their cruelty.

In like manner K. *Charles* I. or rather Archbiſhop *Laud*, forc'd the Church of *Ireland* to conform to all the *Engliſh* rites and ceremonies, in ſpite of Archbiſhop *Uſher*, who was much troubled at it. Farther, when *Laud* became Archbiſhop, he play'd the tyrant moſt egregiouſly, for he forc'd all foreigners in *England* and all *Engliſh* men in foreign countries, to order their worſhip according to the manner of the Church of *England*. But who can do otherwiſe than deteſt his wicked and arrogant lordlineſs? For if it was a crime for foreigners to differ from the *Engliſh* worſhip, while they liv'd in *England*; why ſhould not *Engliſh* men, who liv'd abroad, be bound by the ſame law, to conform themſelves to the practice of thoſe Churches, among whom they reſided? Our Author, as I ſaid, ſhews himſelf very deſirous of a *General Council of Proteſtants*.* But ſince ſuch a council cannot be held, till all Proteſtant Princes and ſtates ſhall agree upon it; our Author was the worſt in the world to propoſe it, becauſe he elſewhere laſhes K. *James* I. for the ſame thing. *When there was*, ſays he, *ſuch a buz in the world about the* Quinquarticular *controverſies, we might have reſted in peace, if we could have regulated our ſtudies by the writings of the ancient Fathers, and the cuſtoms of our predeceſſors; and our learned King had not vouchſaf'd to ſtoop below the dignity of Royal Majeſty, and the cares of government, to Academical exerciſes, and import the wranglings of* Dutch *Profeſſors into his own Dominions*.† And why may not Kings and States abroad as well fear, leſt by ſuch a Council,

* *p.* 149. † *p.* 176.

cil, as is here propos'd, they ſhould *import into their dominions the wranglings* of the *Engliſh* Divines? I hardly think a more general Synod than that was at *Dort*, is to be expected in our times.

The Doctor paſſes a complement upon us that he may ſhew his ſlight of our Predeceſſors. *Nor are there wanting*, ſays he, *among the Diſſenting Miniſters, eſpecially among the Presbyterians, many very learned and pious perſons, who entertain a better opinion of our Church, than their predeceſſors have done. For all the old Adverſaries of our Church, who for ſo many years together had made ſuch oppoſition againſt it (as in the courſe of our relation we have ſhewn) are all in their graves; and many of the young men who have ſucceeded them in their miniſtry, do not bear the ſame enmity to our Church as their predeceſſors; but they often vouchſafe to ſpeak kindly to us, to keep up a charitable correſpondence with us, and ſometimes to maintain a ſtrict degree of friendſhip.* * Nor have our predeceſſors been backward to the ſame thing, when they could do it without danger. If we younger Miniſters have done any thing that is pleaſing to them, we are glad of it, and thank them for the kind notice they take of it. But we can't like they ſhould commend us, only the more to diſgrace our predeceſſors. For in ſpite of all that our Adverſaries can ſay, thoſe moſt pious and learned men will be had in everlaſting honour. To converſe with the Clergy was formerly dangerous, leſt our Miniſters ſhould be diſcover'd by them, and ſo caſt into priſon; or leſt ſuch Clergymen ſhould bring themſelves by that means under a ſuſpicion, or diſgrace among their own party. But, if there were occaſion for it, I could name the Clergymen, who not only ſhun all correſpondence with us, but very induſtriouſly teach their people to do ſo too.

I paſs over what our Author has more in this Part, as foreign to our controverſy; and ſhall haſten to the examination of the *Defence* it ſelf.

* *Page* 145.

A VIN-

A VINDICATION OF THE *DISSENTERS.*

PART II.

In Answer to Dr. NICHOLS's First Part, concerning the Doctrine of the Church of *England.*

The INTRODUCTION.

THIS usual among the generality of men, stifly to maintain the opinions and customs they have once embrac'd, without regard to truth or justice. This happens especially when men gain, or hope to gain by it. The experience of all ages has testify'd, there never is a want of men to undertake the defence of those things, which the supreme powers are pleas'd to injoin, and recommend by external advantages annex'd to them. There are always at

hand such pliable souls, as will submit to, vindicate, and commend every law of the magistrate, and encourage him to inforce it. Let him require things evil and wicked, they make no difficulty to commend them as excellent, or at least as tolerable. Nay, while they pretend a regard to peace, they stick not to commend, as *venerable for their great antiquity*,* the things which they esteem *indifferent*, and others count sinful; and so they abet that imposing them, which must unavoidably beget strife and contention. Had it not been for this, many of the things in controversy between us, which are all useless, some doubtful, and some unlawful, had been long ago laid aside; nor would our Adversaries have forborn mending that discipline, which they themselves acknowledge is *short of what good men wish for*,† and whose enormities discover themselves at first sight. If our Clergy did not gape after great honours, and fat benefices, they would rather employ themselves in persuading our rulers to restore peace, by removing the occasions of our contentions; than in reviling their Brethren, and wresting the words of antient and modern authors, to *put the better colour* upon their cause. But what will not the *love of money* do, which is *the root of all evil*? ‖

I desire I may be herein understood to design to shew, how easily Dr. *Nichols*'s Preamble may be retorted upon his own party. I would not be thought to doubt, that several of the Episcopal Clergy are mov'd by different considerations to submit to the Hierarchy; who, while they dont see they are guilty of Schism, out of a certain dread of it, bear with those things, which they would otherwise think intolerable. 'Tis not our business to search the secrets of mens hearts, which are known to God only. Let every one remember he must give an account of his own actions to God, and therefore judge of others according to the law of Charity. If any of our side have transgress'd that law, I will not undertake their defence. But I wish our Adversaries, when they are very free in their charges against us, would remember the counsel of our Saviour: *First cast out the beam out of thine own eye, and then shalt thou see clearly to cast out the mote out of thy brother's eye.* ‡ Let us see how our Author observes this advice.

Having

---

* *See page* 352. † *See page* 344. ‖ 1 Tim. vi. 10. ‡ Matth. vii. 5.

Having narrowly, says he, *consider'd this matter, I thought it highly probable, that those persons, who heretofore had led the way to this unhappy separation from the Church of* England, *and loaded her constitution with so many, and so great faults, have had hardly any other motive to so ill a design, than to put the better colour upon their resolv'd separation; rather than they themselves, in their conscience, believ'd those grievous accusations, which they charg'd her with, to be justly deserv'd.* *

But what advantage have we by the separation? how should that come to appear so amiable and desirable a thing to us? Are we so aukward and perverse, that for the love of separation only we have objected so many things against them, and suffer'd so often by fines, distresses, and imprisonment, sometimes even unto death? We are not, I can assure our Adversaries, so fond of such kind of fruits of separation, as to be solicitous to see if any good colour can be found, that may be put upon it. As we are men, we cannot but be averse to troubles, reproaches, revilings and persecutions. Nor are we so senseless, as to prefer the great afflictions we struggled with for so many years, for their own sakes, to the ease and splendor in which the *English* Clergy liv'd in the mean time. Nay, we can still, with our ancestors, solemnly appeal to God, the searcher of our hearts, that we separate from them for no other reason, than that we may keep a good Conscience, and discharge our duty to God, as we judge he has requir'd us in his word. For what? do we not, since the fury of persecution, live contented in mean circumstances? when if we trod in their steps, we might as well expect Benefices, Prebends, Deaneries and Bishopricks? But the Doctor here took upon him to search our hearts, which is a thing he blames himself, *page* 171. But since I have elsewhere cited the passage, I shall here omit it.

Now that the common people might not be impos'd upon by these practices, which there have been never wanting some persons or other to exercise, our Divines have with great prudence wrote several English *books, in defence of the Church.*

Our Brethren abroad may guess what kind of books they are by this *Defence* of the Doctor: for he has taken out the best of them, and put it into his *Defence*, making some additions of his own. And truly if there be any

* *page* 154.

weight in the judgment of a person, indifferently acquainted with the controversy (which I suppose I may pretend without vanity) and who first began to consider it with a mind pretty much leaning to the Church of *England*'s side; there is but little in those writings more than a specious and deceitful colour, artfully put many times upon very bad things. They seldom endeavour to answer our arguments fairly represented; but with wonderful acuteness answer such as they have been pleas'd to devise for us; and then they egregiously triumph, as tho' they had obtain'd a glorious victory. Of this I had experience enough, in a controversy I had not long since with Dr. *Wells*. Whether I have reason for what I say or no, may be conjectur'd from this Piece of Dr. *Nichols*.

The commendations he is pleas'd to bestow upon his Church are of little importance, and therefore I shall the more briefly touch upon them. *I am sensible*, says he, *what an important affair I am to manage, while I appear as the Advocate of the most illustrious Church in the whole Reformation.** Remember, I beseech you, what part you have taken upon you to act; and since you are but an *Advocate*, have a little patience till your judges give their opinion, which, 'tis possible, may widely differ from yours. *A Church, which the choicest engines of Popish tyranny have been employ'd to batter, and raze from the very foundations:* The very name of the *Reformation* has been hateful to Popish tyranny. The Papists have always beheld all Reformed Churches with envy, and have mortally hated them. And whoever examines the state of the Churches of *France*, *Savoy*, *Bohemia*, *Hungary*, *Poland*, and many parts of *Germany*, will be sensible *the choicest engines of Popish tyranny have been employ'd to batter* them, *and raze* them *from the very foundations*. And if they have been more costly, or curious in the *engines* they have *employ'd* against the Church of *England*, 'tis not to be imputed to the perfection of the Reformation of that Church, but to the largeness of the revenues they hoped to gain by her overthrow. *A Church, which hath ever been deservedly esteem'd the most impregnable fortress of the Protestant religion.* But I would fain understand, in what sense this is true of the Church of *England*. Is it that she is seated in a more potent kingdom, than any of the other Reform'd Churches? In

* page 156.

In that ſenſe the Church of *Scotland*, nay and the Diſſenters themſelves, are no inconſiderable part of this *fortreſs*. But our Adverſaries craftily confound, or diſtinguiſh, the Church and the Kingdom, juſt as they ſee it will beſt ſerve their purpoſe. If therefore we here diſtinguiſh them, as we certainly ought, and the Epiſcopal Church is conſider'd by itſelf, how is ſhe then the *moſt impregnable fortreſs of the Proteſtant religion*? Has ſhe deſerv'd this eſteem by her rites, or by her faith? by thoſe things wherein ſhe is ſingular, or thoſe ſhe has in common with other Reform'd Churches? If it be ſaid, ſhe has deſerv'd this eſteem by her rites and ceremonies; the foreign Churches, who have with diſdain rejected thoſe rites, will never place much confidence in ſuch a fortreſs. If ſhe is ſaid to have deſerved it by her faith; I grant, ſhe has deſerv'd great commendation, that ſhe has brought up many noble champions of the Proteſtant faith: but unleſs we will be unjuſt to our Brethren abroad, we muſt alſo acknowledge the ſame concerning their Churches. And if our Brethren conſider the faith expreſs'd in the 39 Articles, I fear leſt the Doctor, and ſuch whoſe defence he undertakes in his Firſt Part, ſhould be rather eſteem'd by them the betrayers than the fortreſs of the faith. Nor are our Brethren ignorant, that there has been ſometimes ſuch a garriſon in this fortreſs, as were for yielding it up to the Papiſts, endeavouring to bring about an union between the Church of *Rome*, and the Church of *England*. But if ſhe is therefore call'd the fortreſs of the Proteſtant religion, becauſe, as he adds in the next words, ſhe is *a Church which boaſts of frequent and glorious triumphs over all the powers of* Romiſh *ſuperſtition*; why ſhould not other Churches be as truly impregnable fortreſſes as ſhe; ſince they have in like manner conquer'd, tho' they are leſs noiſy in their triumphing and boaſting; and ſince there is no charge lies againſt them, of any treacherous dealing with the common enemy? There is only one ſenſe, I can think of, in which the Church of *England* can deſervedly claim this title of a *fortreſs* ſo peculiarly to her ſelf; and that is, becauſe ſhe is more than any other Reform'd Church addicted to fighting, and is always arm'd to defend her own party, and tread down her oppoſites by perſecution. In which ſenſe we have by ſad experience found her a fortreſs, not of the Proteſtant religion, but of her own peculiarities.

Having thus consider'd his Introduction, I shall proceed to examine what he says concerning the particular points of our controversy. Several Chapters in this former Part of his *Defence* are really foreign to it, and were therefore omitted wholly in my Answer. Indeed the last Chapter is almost the only one of this Part, which immediately affects our quarrel. All the several Chapters which relate to doctrinal matters, relate only to objections against some particular Divines: which though I examin'd in the Answer design'd for Foreigners, I shall wholly wave in this Translation, design'd for the use of my own Countrymen. The Dissenters never objected against the Articles, or against subscribing them, that they were *Arminian*; however they objected (and very justly) against those who subscrib'd them, being of a judgment quite contrary to that declar'd in them. I should therefore pass directly to the last Chapter, were it not that the first has somewhat, which has from the beginning of our controversy been in debate, and that of late there may seem to be some more than ordinary reason, why I should take notice of it.

CHAP. I.

Of Popery charg'd on the Church of England.

I shall offer some observations in general concerning this accusation, before I particularly examine what the Doctor says upon this occasion. *

1. We never said, the Church of *England* was Popish. 'Tis quite another thing, when we charge some persons in her communion with Popish errors. That charge were easily made good, by producing various examples of such a kind of men; were not the thing too notorious for our Author himself to deny it, as we shall see afterward.

2. What we pretend is, that the Reformation of the Church of *England* is much more imperfect, than that of the Foreign Churches; inasmuch as she retains many of the relicks of Popery, which they have utterly rejected.

By

* *page* 158.

By Popery, we mean the whole body of errors, superstitions, or whatever corruptions found in the Church of *Rome*. Two things therefore are intended by this accusation: first, that the things themselves objected against are evil; secondly, that they are used by the Papists, and were deriv'd to us from them. Concerning the latter there is no dispute, since 'tis granted by our Adversaries. 'Tis only in the former therefore we are concern'd. Hence it appears how little he talks to the purpose, *p.* 165, 166.

3. When we call the things objected against *relicks of Popery*, we do it not so much for the sake of reproaching the Churchmen, many of whom have, as we have seen, spoken in the same manner concerning them; as to excite and urge them, by that consideration, utterly to abolish them. For since they acknowledge the Church of *Rome* to be the most corrupt of any in the world, why should they not in like manner acknowledge her to be the most unworthy of imitation? Why should they affect a conformity to the worst of Churches, rather than to such as are Reform'd? Further, the Church of *Rome* was formerly reckon'd Antichristian, as appears by the *Homilies*, and by the *Book of Common Prayer*, * before Archbishop *Laud* alter'd it in favour of the *Papists*; as is witness'd by Dr. *Heylyn*. † Nay there were formerly, as there are still, many eminent and learn'd writers in the Church of *England*, who made no difficulty of affirming, that the Church of *Rome* is the very *whore* describ'd in the *Revelation*. And if that be true, 'tis but reasonable we should reject all her impertinent ceremonies, and avoid all manner of communion with her. If we may believe those Gentlemens interpretations, we are thus directed by the Holy Ghost, in those Words: *Come out of her my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues.* ‖ This argument then, however 'tis counted invidious, plainly proves, they were ill advis'd who retain'd those Popish usages. For what our Adversaries here alledge is weak enough, *viz.* that these things were formerly in use. They were so indeed, but it was in the most corrupt Church in the world; whence they were also deriv'd after she had

* *See also* Dr. Nichols, *p.* 163. † Cypr. Angl. *p.* 118. ‖ Rev. xviii. 4.

defil'd them with the groſſeſt ſuperſtition; but there is no ſign of them in the Holy Scripture, the only rule both of our faith and worſhip. They therefore, who abhor the ſuperſtition of that Church, are very much in the wrong to affect a reſemblance of her themſelves, or require it in others. For without any neceſſity, and in ſpite of the Apoſtle's forbidding of it, they *put a ſtumbling-block, and an occaſion of falling in their brothers way*, * and raiſe an evil ſuſpicion of themſelves in their minds. I know they ſay theſe things are older than Popery. But the anſwer is eaſy. For in the firſt place, this is plainly falſe of many of the things in controverſy. And ſecondly, Popery grew up by degrees, and it conſiſts of many ſuperſtitions, which did not all riſe in one and the ſame age; but ſome of them ſprung up in a conſiderable tract of time from beginnings that were antient enough, but yet very ſmall at firſt; for which reaſon we ought the more to beware of ſuch ſmall beginnings, and pluck up the ſeeds of ſuperſtition, as ſoon as ever they begin to appear. And thus the old Puritans are to be underſtood, when they cenſure the Church for the relicks of Popery: and we are not aſham'd herein to imitate them. Nor has Dr. *Nichols* any reaſon to upbraid us, for any hard words uſed upon this occaſion. For what volleys of reproaches does his own ſide continually diſcharge againſt us? We are by them ordinarily term'd Fanatics, Puritans, Rebels, Schiſmatics in a damnable condition, worſe than Papiſts, abettors of Judaiſm and Turciſm. And tho' they ſeem'd a little while to be ſo much in humour, as to confine theſe their reproachful terms to us in *England*; yet we knew when it was uſual with them to load all the Presbyterians in the world with the ſame. If the ſevereſt expreſſions of the moſt rigid of our ſide are compar'd with theſe, they ſeem very mild. We will therefore now inſtance in ſome of the Puritans expreſſions produc'd by our Author.

Mr. Gilby, *an old Puritan, ſaid, the habits and ceremonies uſed in the Church of* England *were carnal, beggarly, Antichriſtian pomps.* A mighty crime! If the Apoſtle was not afraid to call the Jewiſh ceremonies *carnal*, † tho' they were of God's

* Rom. xiv. 13. † Heb. ix. 10. vii. 16.

God's own preſcribing; why might not Mr. *Gilby* ſay the ſame of the Popiſh ceremonies, which never had any divine appointment? If the one call'd the Jewiſh ceremonies, *weak and beggarly elements*; * why might not the other call the Popiſh ceremonies, *beggarly pomps*? And if they were really Popiſh, they were *Antichriſtian* too, in the Opinion of the Epiſcopal party that liv'd in Mr. *Gilby*'s time, who all agreed the Pope was Antichriſt. So Biſhop *Ridley*, altho' once a ſtiff defender of the ceremonies, when he had the Surplice forc'd upon him, bitterly inveigh'd againſt the Biſhop of *Rome*, calling him *Antichriſt*; † and againſt that habit, calling it fooliſh, abominable, and not fit for a Vice in a play. So Biſhop *Jewel* call'd the garments, relicks of Popery; and Biſhop *Horn* term'd them Popiſh, as I have obſerv'd already from Biſhop *Burnet*. Why therefore might not Mr. *Gilby* ſay, they were *Popiſh fopperies*, *Romiſh relicks*, *rags of Antichriſt*, *dregs of diſguis'd Popery*?

Mr. *Cartwright*, or rather the author of the *Admonition*, his words are not fairly ſet down. Thus they are in the Book itſelf: "And as the names of Archbiſhops, "Archdeacons, Lord Biſhops, Chancellors, &c. are drawn "out of the Pope's ſhop, together with their offices; ſo "the government which they uſe, by the life of the "Pope, which is the Canon Law, is Antichriſtian and De-"viliſh, and contrary to the Scriptures." ‖ Biſhop *Whitgift* in his Anſwer acknowledges, whatever in the Canon Law was contrary to the Scripture, was Antichriſtian and Deviliſh. And that this government is contrary to Scripture, I ſhall, if I miſtake not, fully prove in its proper place. However, I ſhould not have lik'd the paſſage the leſs, had it been expreſs'd in ſofter terms. I paſs over the two next paſſages, becauſe they only contain a diſpleaſing truth. But it ſeems the author of *Jerubbaal* (who is not right quoted, either as to the title, the year when printed, or the page) ſpeaks of the *ſuperſtitious* and *idolatrous abuſe of the Liturgy*. I could not find the place, but will ſuppoſe the words fairly ſet down. And in anſwer I ſay: We have always affirm'd, the ceremonies preſcrib'd by the Liturgy ſavour'd of ſuperſtition; which will not ſeem ſtrange to any one, who ſeriouſly conſiders the matter. As to what he adds of the *idolatrous abuſe of the Liturgy*, I ſuppoſe his mean-

* Gal. iv. 9. † Fox *Martyr*, *vol.* 3. *p.* 500. ‖ *Admon. p.* 14.

meaning is to be fetch'd from the Churchmens extravagant affection to that Book; as the Apoſtle, upon the like account, terms *covetouſneſs*, *idolatry*. Nor will any man, who knows their diſpoſition, look upon this as a falſe charge. The other paſſages, here alledg'd, relate to doctrinal matters, and therefore I take no notice of them; but leaving the marginal Citations, come to our Author's Text.

Our Adverſaries (*I ſuppoſe*) *dont really believe we are guilty of the things they object againſt us*, &c. * Our Author is miſtaken: we are firmly perſuaded of the truth of our objections. And had it been our deſign to render the Churchmen odious, we had taken a very different courſe from what we have done.

We muſt confeſs, that of later days we have been leſs annoy'd from this quarter. † How glad ſhould I be, could I return this compliment! But truly our Adverſaries ſtill treat us with the ſame hatred and reproaches, they formerly uſed to do. We thank God, they cannot cruſh us with their wonted degree of perſecution. But what our Author next adds, is a miſtake: *Not that our Adverſaries have leſs pretence for it now, than formerly:* If we conſider the things themſelves, 'tis true, the ſame relicks of Popery are now retain'd; but if we mind the temper of the age, we may congratulate our ſelves in its being ſomewhat alter'd. For in the beginning of Queen *Elizabeth*'s reign, a vaſt number of the Clergy, who had been profeſs'd Papiſts in her Siſter's time, continu'd in their former opinion, notwithſtanding they would not part with their livings. And we are well ſatisfy'd, what many of the Biſhops and Clergy in King *Charles* the Firſt's time were. But we chearfully acknowledge they are now more averſe to the Papiſts. ‖ *But the calumny is grown ſo notorious and palpable, that no body will ſwallow it; it being too well known with what vigour, zeal, and conſtancy we oppos'd the* Romaniſts; *and how dear and gracious they were to them, at a time when all our intereſts, ſacred and civil, were in the greateſt danger to be loſt.* We all believe ſtill thoſe things were *rags* or *relicks* of *Popery*, which our anceſtors call'd by that name. That the Divines of the Church of *England*

* *page* 159. † *page* 160.

‖ *So we thought when this was firſt written; but, alas! they have ſince ſteer'd a contrary courſe, and effectually convinc'd us of our over charitable error.*

England wrote bravely against the Papists in King *James* the Second's time, is question'd by none of us; nor do we envy them the great honour they deserv'd; but we justly complain of unfair dealing, when we are represented as siding with them, as I have observ'd in the former Part. They who refus'd our offer'd service, now the work is done, make heavy complaints for the want of it. And if we were so *gracious at that time with the Romanists*, how came it to pass they should be able to decoy none from among us, while they made so many proselytes among the Churchmen? But what ground is there for this odious charge? Only, forsooth, because when King *James* deliver'd us from the most cruel persecution, some of our people, too easily believing he did it out of kindness, gave him abundance of thanks in their Addresses. But the Dissenters were not the only men impos'd upon by his fraudulent practices. As long as he set on the Churchmen to disturb our religious assemblies, and break up our houses, and seize our goods, they generally extoll'd him with the character of *James the Just*; nay, and set the Dissenters an example, in the no less fulsom Addresses they presented to him, and his Brother before him. But the Clergy might, it seems, honourably do, what is very criminal in the Dissenters. So miserably does a fond self-love blind some mens eyes! Let it likewise be remember'd, with whom our Adversaries were *very gracious*, when Popish counsels prevail'd, and our Ministers were turn'd out, and grievously persecuted; or when the Bishops had a main hand in flinging out the Bill of Exclusion, which the generality of the Clergy likewise condemn'd. We are much mistaken, if any of these their proceedings were serviceable to the Protestant religion.

But if our Church bears so much towards Popery, how came it to pass that the Founders of it, Cranmer, Ridley, Latimer, *and others of the greatest sanctity, fell a sacrifice to Popish rage and fury? Why did not that Church rather embrace them as its best and surest friends?* Hardly any thing can be said weaker than this. We never doubted, that the Church of *England* was widely different from the Church of *Rome*; we own she is freed from innumerable *Romish* superstitions, and we bless God for it. And yet we are not afraid to affirm, she retains still a tast of the old leaven, which ought to be purg'd out. Those holy martyrs did not perceive every thing, tho' they did a great many; and when they reform'd a multitude of abuses, they retain'd some, which they deriv'd

riv'd from the Papists. What then? Will the Church of *Rome* look upon them for this, as her *best and surest friends*? A pleasant Dream! They who think so, are sadly deceiv'd, and must be quite unacquainted with the spirit of Popery. For Papists are never satisfy'd with those who differ a hair's breadth from them, or if their usurp'd authority be in the least oppos'd. Since then those blessed martyrs had rejected a great many, though not all the *rags of Popery*, and had shaken off the yoke of their tyrannical government; what wonder was it, that they *fell a sacrifice to Popish rage and fury*? I would only ask, whether any relicks of Popery were left in K. *Edward*'s first Edition of the Liturgy? If that be granted, as it must be by every one who reads it, what can be infer'd by this rare argument? For 'tis certain, the Papists were as well displeas'd with their first pains in altering the Service, as with their second, when they made a further reformation of Popish abuses. Our Author has elsewhere observ'd, that our Reformation in *England* was made by the Parliament and Convocation; but there were many of all ranks in each, who retain'd their old sentiments, and therefore hinder'd the work all that ever they could. Hence it came to pass, that those relicks of Popery were retain'd in the Reform'd Church of *England*. Nor was it in the power of those, who greatly endeavour'd it, to compleat the Reformation according to their desire. But 'tis a base calumny, to pretend we think *the difference between* those holy men, and the Church of *Rome*, was *very small*. We think they went far from that Church, and would have gone farther, if death, and the iniquity of the times had not hinder'd them.

If we are such fond retainers of Romish *superstitions, how came the champions of them to strike at us above all other men? If our ancestors have rightly inform'd us, the Gunpowder Plot was not level'd against the Puritan Ministers, or a few of the Nobility who patroniz'd them: but that sudden destruction was prepar'd for our King, who was a strict defender of our Church; for the whole body of Bishops; and for such of our great men, as under Q.* Elizabeth*'s Reign had enacted good laws for the establishment of this Church.* *

How acutely is this spoken! Our Adversaries think, the Papists design'd to spare the Puritans in the terrible slaughter

---

* *page* 161.

ter they were contriving! Now I would very gladly see this a little clear'd, that we might comprehend, what cunning device the Papists had to provide for the safety of the Puritan Members of Parliament, both among the Lords and Commons, when they intended with gunpowder to blow up the whole house, where they met, and were mix'd with one another. And *if our ancestors have rightly inform'd us*, the design of the plotters was, immediately after the blow was given, to charge it upon the Puritans, and massacre them for it. And if, as he seems to suggest, the Papists never attempted any thing against us; how comes it to pass, that the blame of the turning out our Ministers, and of the persecution which follow'd thereupon, is now laid by the Church upon them? But lo another argument, much of the same strength with the former, to prove this!

And we cannot forget how the Jesuits under K. James II. *when they struck at the very heart of the Reform'd religion, gave no disturbance to Dissenting Academies; but furiously fell upon our Colleges, and begun to banish our Students from those seats of learning.* Truly I can't tell, whom we are most oblig'd to thank, the Papists or the Churchmen; the former, that they did not take from us what we had not; or the latter, that they had taken effectual care to strip us of all, lest we should have any thing to tempt the avarice of those robbers. And if they then *fell furiously upon your Colleges, and begun to banish your Students from those seats of learning*, they only wrote after the copy you had set them before, in your usage of us.

The stories of *Faithful Cummin*, and *Thomas Heath*, * are some of the Church's pious frauds, contriv'd only to blacken us; of which we are as sure, as we can well be of any thing of this nature. This is most fully prov'd, in the *Answer to Dr.* Scot's *Case of Forms of Prayer*; to which when I refer'd Dr. *Wells*, who had mention'd them, and urg'd him to answer that author's arguments; he only reply'd, that he did not before know of any such writing, and never attempted to vindicate those foolish forgeries. And I cannot but wonder at the confidence of those many authors, who go on to revile us with those lies, without first answering what has been so solidly writ against them. I therefore pass these stories over. But the reader in the end of the chapter will meet with a *Rowland* for his *Oliver*.

In

* *page* 162.

In the next place he argues, that *the Articles (which not only Clergymen, but all Students in our Universities, are obliged by their subscriptions to acknowledge and maintain) do put it out of all doubt, that heaven and earth are not at greater distance, than our religion is from Popery.* * Since the conclusion is not deny'd, we need not trouble our selves about the premises. Nevertheless the argument is not of any strength. The Articles of the Church of *England* are as contrary to Arminianism, as to Popery; and therefore 'tis as possible the Church should abound with Papists, as with Arminians. And if there were any force in this argument, it would as well defend Bp. *Montague*, Dr. *Heylyn*, Mr. *Thorndike*, and Bp. *Parker*, who obliged themselves, by the same *subscriptions*, *to acknowledge and maintain the Articles.* And yet our Author owns, they have *advanc'd some Popish doctrines in their writings.* †

Since the Doctor quite misses his aim, and does not really dispute against our opinion, 'tis very proper I should here declare what it is. Our opinion then is: That the will of God, discover'd in the Holy Scriptures, is the only rule of religious worship; and that 'tis not lawful for men to devise any new ways of worshiping him, or to receive, and practise any such, when devis'd by other men. When therefore religion is become corrupted and defiled, and there is a necessity of a reformation, we think men ought to go as far back as the first institution, and that every thing is to be try'd and corrected according to that standard. ‖ But that *we must allow nothing common with them*, is what we never thought, and much less ever said. Whatever is necessary for life, or by a divine command, is never to be rejected; but when such things have crept into the worship of God, as are neither necessary nor useful, and have become in tract of time, if they were not at first, superstitious or idolatrous, we think they ought to be abolish'd. And that for two reasons: namely, that we may express the greater abhorrence of superstition; and that we may not, by retaining them, lead men into superstition. Thus, for instance, the most antient use of the sign of the Cross was not free from all superstition, but it pav'd the way to greater afterward; and being now retain'd in baptism, has bred superstition in some Churchmen;

---

* *page* 164. † *page* 169. ‖ *See Mr.* Calvin's *Letter to the Protector.*

men; which I will demonstrate from our Author himself. 'Tis certainly superstitious for men to look upon *baptism* as *lame and deficient*, when administer'd without the addition of this ceremony. And yet this, our Author says, is the opinion of some of their people, who, if it were laid aside, would be *frighted from such a baptism to that of the Church of* Rome. * So that if the use of this sign were not in itself superstitious; yet since it is known to breed superstition in ignorant people, it ought to be rejected. Thus the reader has our opinion. Let him mind now what inferences our Author would draw from it.

If this be right reasoning, why dont these sanctified men hold to their own rule? Why dont they, in the abundance of their zeal, reject every thing, that has ever been touch'd with superstition? But we know very well, they contend for one thing, and practise another. They dont presently throw away their Bibles, because Papists have perverted them to maintain their errors; or, what is more execrable, because they have been misapplied by conjurers and witches. †

Who does not see a vast difference between these things, and those we dispute about? All are bound by God's command to keep and read the Holy Scriptures; but we are so far from being commanded, that we are forbidden by him to retain superstitious rites and ceremonies.

They dont think it a grievous sin to hold their meetings, every Lord's Day, in those places, which are prophan'd all the week besides, by the balls and dancings of light and wanton persons.

I wish he had told us plainly, whether these *balls and dancings* did in his opinion prophane the place itself, and render it unfit to be used in the worship of God. If he thought so, he would have done well to tell us, how it comes to pass, that the dancers, who as Christians are the temples of God, are not themselves prophan'd by these things, and upon that account excluded from the communion of his own Church. Nay, if these dances can prophane a place, why may they not be thought as well to prophane the Lord's Day? But our Adversaries were once of another judgment, when those dances were allow'd on the Lord's Day, and they publish'd to the people the King's declaration for them. For our part we know of no place under the New Testament, that is either holy or prophane any

* *page* 269. † *page* 165.

any longer than 'tis actually put to any holy or prophane use. We are allow'd in *any place to lift up holy hands to God.** And altho' our Adversaries think fit to object sometimes against our worship, the prophaneness of the places wherein it is perform'd; yet *we know very well, they contend for one thing, and practise another.* They can themselves upon occasion hold their assemblies in prophane places. Thus they do at *Stirbitch Fair*, in the open field, in the midst of the fair. Nor does the University of *Cambridge* think St. *Mary*'s Church prophan'd, by their keeping their *Commencement* in it, and by the many bantering, scoffing and immodest speeches made in it upon that occasion; nor do they esteem it unfit upon that account to be used in the worship of God, without a new consecration.

But to speak to the practice of Hezekiah, *what does it but make for our praise?* †

How very different the course *Hezekiah* took, was from that taken by our Adversaries, will appear, if we consider these following things.

1. That the superstitious, and idolatrous use of the sign of the Cross had prevail'd among the Papists, for many ages before the Reformation; just as the like use of the Brazen Serpent had prevail'd among the *Jews* in *Hezekiah*'s time.

2. *Hezekiah* might as easily have abolish'd the superstitious and idolatrous abuse of the Brazen Serpent, if he had preserv'd the thing itself; as the Churchmen might the like abuse of the sign of the Cross, if they continued the use of it. So far there is an exact agreement of the two cases: let us now see wherein they differ.

3. *Hezekiah*, that he might take away all occasion of superstition and idolatry, broke the Brazen Serpent, and utterly destroy'd it: but the Churchmen, on the contrary, retain the Cross in baptism, and Crucifixes in some of their Churches.

4. The Brazen Serpent was made by God's own express order; and when its primary design and use was at an end, it was an illustrious monument of the divine power and goodness. But the sign of the Cross was never prescrib'd by God, serves no good purpose, nor can be justly reckon'd any monument of divine power and goodness. So that *Hezekiah*

* 1 Tim. ii. 8. † *page* 166.

Hezekiah might have alledg'd much more plausible excuses for his preserving the Brazen Serpent, while he took away the abuse of it; than the Churchmen can, for retaining in like manner the sign of the Cross.

5. *Hezekiah's* act is commended by every body; but this of the Churchmen is so far from being commended by any body, that 'tis condemn'd, not only by the Reform'd Churches abroad, but by several of their own Church; and even the Papists themselves, whom they seek to please hereby, do but laugh at them for it. But we go on with our Author.

For we have abolish'd all those usages, which had any appearance of superstition in them: This I deny. Every one knows the ceremony of the sign of the Cross, as used among the Papists, *had some appearance of superstition in it*, and yet they have not abolish'd it. Nay, and let any one judge, whether the reason alledg'd elsewhere, against laying it aside, does not carry superstition enough in it? "And less than this we could not do, "unless we would wholly efface this mark of the Lord Jesus, "and so gratify Mahometans and Heathens in the highest "degree." * But he adds: *and are ready to part with the rest, whenever it shall appear to us, that they endanger our peoples relapsing into idolatry.* That which has been, may be again; and prudent men should take care to prevent it. Our Adversaries are not ignorant, what a handle these things gave to Bishop *Mountagu*, Bishop *Parker*, and some others: and why should they not take care that their people may not *relapse* into *superstition*, as well as into *idolatry*? Now that they take occasion to relapse into that, I have shewn already from his own words. Further, why should they not take away all occasions of idolatry from strangers, as well as their own people? Popish strangers, when they go into the *English* Cathedrals, with an idolatrous mind; if not with an idolatrous outward behaviour, behold and reverence the Crucifix plac'd upon the altar.

Our first Reformers, when they set about their work, did not so much consider what had been abus'd by superstition, as how to prevent such abuses for the future.

Why might not *Hezekiah* in like manner have sav'd the Brazen Serpent, *not so much* considering how the Jews *had abus'd it by their superstition, as how to prevent such abuses for the future*? But *Hezekiah* knew nothing of this method of reformation; which, I suppose, receives the greater lustre

* *pag.* 270.

by being compar'd with his defective *practice*; which, our Author tells us, *makes for their praise.*

He here adds a very weak reason: *We are not (as the* Jews *under* Hezekiah *were) inclinable to the idolatries of our neighbours: we abominate their monstrous superstition, above all things in the world.* * When the Reformation was first begun in *England*, the people *were really inclineable to idolatry*, and came not to Protestant worship so much out of love as fear; as has been observ'd in the former Part. If therefore the Episcopal party pretend to be led by this consideration, why should they not have been then led by it? And further, they dont seem so intirely to abominate their superstition, who look upon Baptism *as lame and deficient* without the addition of the sign of the Cross. And since men are naturally more addicted to superstition, than to the purity of worship, too great caution cannot be here easily used. And indeed, if our Reformers had used a little more than they did, I can hardly think the Reformation in *England* would have been in so great danger, as it was in the last Century, or very lately in the present.

Our Author has told us, *That Popish emissaries have often personated Fanatic teachers, and rail'd in their Conventicles against the Church, to the great satisfaction of their hearers* †. I pass over the impious and abusive language of the Translator, because that is of no moment in the controversy. As to the thing it self, whether it be true of the Quakers, or any of the wild Sectaries in *Oliver*'s time, I dont certainly know, and think not material to inquire; but I shall look upon it as a groundless assertion concerning Presbyterian assemblies, till it be prov'd, not by such scandalous lies, as those of *Cummin* and *Heath*, but by substantial evidence. But tho' we deny the thing, yet let us suppose it to have been true, that crafty wretches have deceiv'd plain honest people, and have supplied the place of a Minister, perhaps, in his absence; yet no Presbyterian assembly ever had a Papist for their Pastor, as the Church of *England* has had many such, Rectors and Bishops; or at best, many who were very like them. Our Author acknowledges Bp. *Mountagu* and Bp. *Parker*, Dr. *Hey'yn* and Mr. *Thorndike*, were too much inclin'd to the Papists, in several important points of the Popish controversy. I will add several more, who were of the same kidney; and then consider, what our Author says to excuse them.

Bp.

* *pag.* 167. † *pag.* 162.

Bp. *Mountagu* ow'd his Biſhoprick to his great friend and patron, Archbp. *Laud*. Now he was made Bp. of *Chicheſter* in the year 1628, and of *Norwich* ten years after. * And ſince his principles were enough diſcover'd in his writings before, how can Archbp. *Laud* be thought to have been free from the ſame opinions? But this Archbiſhop is ſo much the darling of the Church, that I ſhall chuſe to ſpeak of him in other mens words, rather than my own. And in the firſt place, let us hear Dr. *Robert Abbot*, who was afterward Bp. of *Salisbury*; but being, at the time I ſpeak of, the King's Profeſſor of Divinity in *Oxford*, and Vicechancellor of the Univerſity, he preach'd a ſermon before the Univerſity againſt *Laud*, who had inveigh'd a little before againſt the Presbyterians in the Pulpit; ſaying, *the Presbyterians were as bad as the Papiſts*. Concerning him Dr. *Abbot* thus gave his judgment: "Some are partly "*Romiſh*, partly *Engliſh*, as occaſion ſerves them, that a man "might ſay unto them: *Are you for us, or for our adverſa-* "*ries*? who, under pretence of truth, and preaching againſt "the Puritans, ſtrike at the heart and root of the faith and "religion now eſtabliſh'd amongſt us. This preaching "againſt the Puritans, was but the practice of *Parſons* and "*Campian*'s counſel, when they came into *England* to ſe- "duce young Students. When many of them were afraid "to loſe their places, if they ſhould profeſſedly be thus; "the counſel they then gave them, was, that they ſhould "ſpeak freely againſt the Puritans, and that ſhould ſuffice. "And they cannot plead they are accounted Papiſts, be- "cauſe they ſpeak againſt the Puritans; but becauſe, be- "ing indeed Papiſts, they ſpeak nothing againſt them. If "they do at any time ſpeak againſt the Papiſts, they do but "beat a little about the buſh, and that but ſoftly too, for "fear of waking and diſquieting the birds that are in it. "They ſpeak nothing, but that wherein one Papiſt will "ſpeak againſt another; as againſt equivocation, and the "Pope's temporal authority, and the like, and perhaps "ſome of their blaſphemous ſpeeches: but in the points "of free will, juſtification, concupiſcence being a ſin after "Baptiſm, inherent righteouſneſs, and certainty of ſalva- "tion, the Papiſts beyond the ſeas can ſay they are whol- "ly theirs; and the Recuſants at home make their brags

* *See* Fuller's Ch. Hiſt. *b.* xi. *p.* 131. Heyl. Cypr. Angl. *p.* 366.

" of them : and in all things they keep themſelves ſo near " the brink, that upon occaſion they may ſtep over to them. " Now for this ſpeech, that *the Presbyterians are as bad as the* " *Papiſts* ; there is a ſting in the ſpeech, which I wiſh had " been left out : for there are many Churches beyond the " ſeas, which contend for the religion eſtabliſhed amongſt " us, and yet have approv'd and admitted the Presbytery. " ------ Might not Chriſt ſay, What art thou ? *Romiſh* or " *Engliſh* ? Papiſt or Proteſtant ? Or what art thou ? a mun- " grel or compound of both ? a Proteſtant by ordination, " a Papiſt in point of free will, inherent righteouſneſs, and " the like ? a Proteſtant in receiving the ſacrament, a Pa- " piſt in the doctrine of the ſacrament ? What ! do you " think there are two heavens ? If there be, get you to " the other, and place your ſelves there ; for in this, where " I am, ye ſhall not come. *

In like manner, Bp. *Hall* thus addreſſes him in a Letter inſcrib'd to him : " I would I knew where to find you, " then I could tell how to take direct aims ; whereas now " I muſt pore and conjecture. To day you are in the tents " of the *Romaniſts* ; to morrow in ours ; the next day be- " tween both, againſt both. Our Adverſaries think you " ours, we theirs ; your conſcience finds you with both, " and neither. I flatter you not. This of yours is the " worſt of all tempers : heat and cold have their uſes ; " lukewarmneſs is good for nothing, but to trouble the ſto- " mach. Thoſe that are ſpiritually hot, find acceptation ; " thoſe that are ſtark cold, have a leſſer reckoning ; the " mean between both is ſo much worſe, as it comes nearer " to good, and attains it not. How long will you halt in " this indifferency ? Reſolve one way, and know at laſt " what you do hold, and what you ſhould. Caſt off either " your wings, or your teeth ; and, loathing this bat-like " nature, be either a bird, or a beaſt. To die wavering and " uncertain, your ſelf will grant fearful. If you muſt ſettle, " when begin you ? if you muſt begin, why not now ? 'Tis " dangerous deferring that, whoſe want is deadly, and " whoſe opportunity is doubtful. God crieth with *Jehu* : " *Who is on my ſide ? who ?* Look at laſt out of your win- " dow to him, and in a reſolute courage caſt down the " *Jezabel*, that hath bewitched you." †

I had

* *See* Renunciation of ſeveral Pop. doctrines ; *and* Heyl. Cypr. Angl. *p.* 66.
† Heyl. Cypr. Angl. *p.* 25.

I had not said so much concerning Archb. *Laud*, had it not been certain that all things in the Church were for many years order'd just according to his pleasure, and that vast numbers of the Clergy were then fallen in with his principles. These omitted nothing, whereby they might oblige the Papists; and they would certainly, and without much difficulty, have join'd themselves into one body with them, if they had had an opportunity. Hence, during the tyranny of that Archbishop, almost all books written against the Papists were suppress'd.

I believe all men will grant Bp. *Gauden* was Churchman enough; and yet he speaks warmly upon this head, in his Sermon before the Commons, *Novemb.* 29. 1640. * He mentions a great many particular corruptions of that time, and shews he vehemently suspected they were about to *re-edify* Babel's *ruins*; and at last says: "By such dangerous symbo-" lizing with them in words, and some outward formali-" ties, we do but prepare our minds, and sweeten them, " with less distast to relish their doctrines and tenets; and, " as it were, in a civil way we complement our selves out " of our truth, giving the adversaries strong hopes and pre-" sumptions, as they have discover'd, that we are inclining " towards them." †

I will here add another story out of Mr. *Prynne*, which will shew how much the University of *Cambridge* was at that time corrupted with Popish opinions. One Mr. *Adams*, in a Sermon before the University, used these expressions: " That a special confession unto a Priest (actually, where " time or opportunity presents it self, or otherwise in ex-" plicit intention and resolution) of all our sins committed " after Baptism, so far forth as we do remember, is neces-" sary unto salvation, in the judgment of Fathers, School-" men, and almost all antiquity, not only *necessitate præcepti*, " but also *necessitate medii*: so that, according to the ordi-" nary or reveal'd means appointed by Christ, there can be " no salvation without the aforesaid confession. —— That " God, being an enemy to all sin, will not pardon any, " if we willingly conceal but one in our confession to the " Priest. That confession is as necessary to salvation, as " the ministry of Baptism; as necessary to salvation, as " meat is to the body." ‖ Dr. *Brownrig*, the Vicechancel-

* The Love of Truth and Peace, p. 31, 32. † p. 33 ‖ Canterb. Doom. p. 193

lor, and some other Doctors, took exceptions at this sermon, as scandalous and Popish. Whereupon Mr. *Adams* was convented before the Vicechancellor and Heads, who both requir'd, and perus'd the copy of his sermon: which done, the Vicechancellor, who mortally hated the Popish superstition, drew up the form of a recantation for him to subscribe, and publish before the Congregation; wherein he was to acknowledge, the doctrine he had deliver'd was both erroneous and dangerous, having no warrant from the Word of God, and crossing the doctrine of the Church of *England*. Mr. *Adams* refus'd to make this recantation. Whereupon, at a full meeting of the Doctors, it was put to the vote, whether this recantation should be injoin'd him, or no? Six voted for it; but they were outnumber'd by these Doctors, who voted against it, *viz.* *Cosins*, *Lany*, *Stearn* (who afterwards were Bishops) *Collins*, *Smith*, *Cumber*, *Martin*, and *Eden*. So far Mr. *Prynne*. Moreover, "Dr. *Cosins* was charg'd to "have set up, in the Church of *Durham*, a marble altar "with Cherubins, with all the appurtenances thereof; "namely, a cope with the Trinity, and God the Father in "the figure of an old man; another with a Crucifix, and "the image of Christ, with a red beard and blue cap. "Besides, he was accus'd for lighting two hundred wax "candles about the altar on Christmas day; for forbidding "Psalms to be sung before or after sermon, tho' he made "an anthem to be sung of the three Kings of *Collen* (by "the names of) *Gaspar*, *Balthazar* and *Melchior*; and for "procuring a consecrated knife, only to cut the bread at "the Communion." * Mr. *Smart*, a Prebendary of that Church, was grievously persecuted by him for disliking and preaching against those things. The same Dr. *Cosins* wrote a Book, entituled, *A Collection of private Devotions, or Hours of Prayer*; wherein, besides the form of the book, taken out of the Popish *Horaries*, and many other things plainly Romish, he acknowledges seven Sacraments. †

Dr. *Lawrence* affirms: "Christ's body is essentially, sub-"stantially, and truly present in the Elements. ‖

Dr. *Kellet* says: "The presence of Christ in the sacrament "is such, as the Eucharist it self must be ador'd." ‡ And if any desire a proof of this, he adviseth them to read *Bellarmin*.

Dr.

* Fuller, Ch. Hist. *b.* ii. *p.* 173. † Heylyn. Cypr. Angl. *p.* 173.
‖ *Cited in the* Renuciat. of several Popish Doct. *p.* 4. ‡ Id. *p.* 5.

Dr. *Godfry Goodman*, the Bishop of *Glouceſter*, was not only Popiſhly affected, but a downright Papiſt; and in his laſt will and teſtament, he declar'd he died in that Communion. I forbear mentioning Bp. *Mountagu* of *Norwich*, Bp. *Neile* of *Wincheſter*, Bp. *Mountain* of *London*, Bp. *Pierce* of *Bath* and *Wells*, and a great many of the inferior Clergy, who were very much inclin'd to the Papiſts in K. *Charles* the Firſt's reign. I could eaſily give a large catalogue of ſuch Biſhops or Prieſts at that time, if I were requir'd, tho' for the preſent I forbear. Nay, in K. *Charles* the Second's reign we had a Bp. of *St. Aſaph*, who order'd to be written upon his tombſtone: *Ora pro anima mea: Pray for my ſoul:* * not to ſay any thing of *Parker*, *Watſon*, and others; and ſome of our own time, *Bret*, *Welton*, &c. Let us now return to our Author.

In ſuch conceſſions as they [Mountagu, Thorndike, &c.] *have made to the* Romaniſts, *concerning Chriſt's bodily preſence in the ſacrament, the worſhip of ſaints and images, and the purity of the* Roman *Church from idolatry, they are condemn'd by the unanimous ſuffrage of our own Divines.* † This is not true of thoſe Divines who liv'd in Bp. *Mountagu*'s time: and tho' the Doctor believ'd it, and I ſhew'd my ſelf ready to aſſent to the truth of it concerning their preſent Divines; yet what has happen'd ſince both our Pieces were firſt printed, will not ſuffer a man to continue in his charitable opinion.

The reaſon why they have never been cenſur'd in Convocation, is partly becauſe no act of Convocation is valid without the royal authority: You ſee now what ſort of a Church that is, which is ſo highly extoll'd; which is not able to guard againſt heretical, ſuperſtitious, and idolatrous Biſhops; or to paſs any cenſure upon them, unleſs his Majeſty thinks fit to order it. Who can now believe, there was never *any wiſer government* than this *in the whole Chriſtian world*? ‖ Beſides, had they not Convocations, which had the King's licence, in the time of *Mountagu*, *Heylyn*, and *Thorndike*? Why then were not they *cenſur'd in Convocation*? This therefore is but little to the purpoſe. *partly becauſe they were not only very ſerviceable to their Prince:* The Doctor might as well have left this out. For if, by diſcharging their duty to their *Prince*, they make amends, in the opinion of our Adverſaries, for the greateſt miſchief done to

* Collect. of Speeches in Parl. concerning the Popiſh Plot. *Lond.* 1681 *p.* 6.
† *pag.* 168. ‖ *See pag.* 347.

truth and piety; 'tis plain the Church must shew it self more solicitous to obey the Prince, than God himself. *but likewise have labour'd very profitably in some parts of divinity.* How little is this also to the purpose? The same thing may be asserted of several Popish writers. There are few, if any Heretics, who reject every truth. If therefore they have *labour'd profitably* in defending some particular truth, must they be thought to deserve no censure, when, by their other mischievous opinions, they quite overthrow religion? Our Author tells us presently, that Bp. *Mountagu was miserably harrass'd with the complaints of Churchmen, as well as Puritans.* Which is true, if by *Churchmen* are understood those, who were averse to Archb. *Laud*'s designs; but we hear of no *complaints* made against him by any of that faction, which was then very numerous.

And tho' under K. Charles II. *the Bishops could do little, but what the court directed; yet knowing* Heylyn *and* Thorndike's *opinions, and that they were disposed to innovations, they kept them out of the governing posts.*

That is, they kept them out of the Bishopricks, the number of which is so small, that they can be granted only to a few. But altho' they wanted the chief preferments, they obtain'd those that were considerable. And if the *Bishops kept them out of the governing posts under* K. Charles II. *when they could do little, but what the court directed*; why did they not in like manner keep out *Mountagu* from a *governing post* in K. *Charles* the First's time, when they manag'd all ecclesiastical matters just as they pleas'd? The truth is, King *Charles* II. kept out those men, who could, if he had pleas'd, have prefer'd them to the highest posts, in spite of the Bishops. And tho' our Author now despises Bp. *Parker*, and that deservedly, with respect to a great many of his writings; yet while he was among the inferior Clergy, he was as much valued as any in the Church. I could not help wondering sometimes, why our Author, who is so free in commending the writings of *Mountagu* and *Heylyn*, should speak so contemptibly of *Parker*'s works. *He is*, says he, *scarce notable for any thing besides smart satyrical expressions.* Whoever reads what he wrote *De Deo*, and *Of the Law of Nature*, must own, that he also *labour'd very profitably in some parts of divinity.* But I perceive, tho' they were all guilty of the same crime, a difference is made between them by the times in which they wrote. Bp. *Parker* publish'd his offensive pieces at a time, when the Doctor thought the

Church

Church was in the greateſt danger, and therefore he diſlikes him. But the Epiſcopal party extremely admire thoſe times wherein *Mountagu* and *Heylyn* wrote, and dont care that any thing but good ſhould be ſpoken of them. And pehaps he might the rather commend the reſt, that he might not be thought partial in praiſing *Heylyn*; who, tho' he never has any regard to truth, in the accounts he gives of his adverſaries; yet was exceeding ſerviceable to our Author, when he was writing his *Hiſtorical Introduction*, and ſupply'd him with a large ſtore of calumnies.

I ſhall now, for the reaſons I gave before, paſs over all the intermediate Chapters, and come to conſider the laſt of this Part.

CHAP. XIII.

Concerning Nonreſiſtance.

IF the candor of the Epiſcoparians were as great, as they endeavour to make us believe it is, they would freely and ingenuouſly own the very great fault their Party has been guilty of in this matter. The Clergy for many years acted, as tho' they deſir'd nothing ſo much, as to have our Kings veſted with an abſolute and unlimited power; and to have the People depriv'd of all their rights, and ſink into the vileſt ſlavery. But our Author is not over conſiſtent with himſelf, and ſeems ſometimes willing to vindicate that monſtrous opinion; and at other times he endeavours to excuſe his party for having defended it; and then again he makes them innocent, and wholly denies the matter; for which he elſewhere attempts to apologize. But let us hear what he ſays.

For anſwer to this heavy charge; we ſay, that ſeveral branches of it are faſten'd upon the whole Church, not only without reaſon, but without the leaſt colour: for amongſt us have been found as eminent patrons of civil liberties, as any they can produce on their ſide. *

I will not deny, there have been ſome few of the Clergy, who have behav'd themſelves as *patrons of our civil liberties*, when they have been in danger. But as the Popiſh opinions of *Mountagu*, *Heylyn*, *Thorndike*, and *Parker*, are not, in our Author's judgment, ſufficient to prove the Church of *England*

* page 225.

England inclin'd to those opinions; so three or four Clergymens dissenting from the rest of their Brethren, is no reason, why it should not be thought the doctrine of the Church, *That the magistrate is not upon any account whatever to be resisted.* Nay, the Clergy used to glory in this, as the peculiar doctrine of their Church. Nor do I here speak of the meaner sort, but of the most eminent both in learning and honorable preferments. And if any then attempted to vindicate the contrary opinion, he was sure to draw upon himself the hatred of his Brethren, as well as the severest punishment. A famous instance of this nature was Mr. *Samuel Johnson*, who, for no other reason, was imprison'd, degraded, disgracefully and cruelly whipt, to the great joy, as is well known, of the Clergy. And not only the sermons of the Clergy, but some other arguments, prove this to have been formerly the doctrine of the Church of *England*. For it was decreed in Convocation, in the year 1640, as I shew'd in the former Part. All the Clergy likewise were oblig'd to subscribe to it; as our Author owns afterwards. *Were the Clergy*, says he, *oblig'd to subscribe one thing, and teach people another?* * And unless that is to be esteem'd the Church's doctrine, which all her Clergy subscribe, how can we possibly come to know what it is? But let us proceed with our Author.

To our own brave men it is we owe the present enjoyment of our religion and laws, which the Objectors friends would have basely betray'd, at a time when they all lay at stake.

If by these *brave men* are meant some of the Laity, I deny not, that there were many such in the Church of *England*, who saw through the designs and craft of the Clergy, and hated this their doctrine. To these *brave men*, indeed, we owe a great deal; concerning whom also he might be thought to speak in this place, when another passage is compar'd with it, wherein he plainly gives up the Clergy as no such defenders of our civil liberties. *If the high States of the kingdom were willing to give away the people's rights and privileges, was it reasonable to expect that a company of helpless Priests should defend them?* † And yet seeing the inquiry is concerning the opinion of the Church of *England*, we are to mind her teachers, and what they taught, and not judge by the behaviour of such Laymen as would not be taught or ruled by

* *page* 233. † *ibid.*

by their Clergy. So that our Author, notwithstanding what he says elsewhere, must be understood here to speak of the Clergy. And if so, what must we think of these men? As long as they thought themselves out of danger, and found themselves kindly treated by the King, they bawl'd out their doctrine without ceasing, that the magistrate was not upon any account to be resisted; and threatned the poor Dissenters with hell torments, because they could not digest that wild opinion, and stir'd up all inferior magistrates against them; wherein they imitated the clemency of those mention'd by the Prophet: *Which have said to thy soul, bow down that we may go over; and to whom thou hast laid thy body as the ground, and as the street to them that go over.* * But no sooner did they perceive themselves in danger, under King *James* II, but they presently, like *Proteus*, put on another shape; and, rejecting their former doctrine, took up new measures. And from that time, 'till very lately, 'twas thought not only a lawful, but a glorious thing to resist the magistrate, whenever he invaded the civil rights and liberties of the people. Who sees not that then there was most need of practising their fine doctrine, and confirming it by their own example? But wise men easily perceiv'd their fraud long before, and expected just what fell out, notwithstanding all their rare preaching to the contrary. Such indeed uses to be the conduct of this kind of interpreters of the law; *who lade men with burthens grievous to be born; while they themselves touch them not with one of their fingers.* † But 'tis not enough for our Adversaries to excuse themselves, unless they likewise load us with base calumnies. Hence is it added: *Which* [religion and the laws] *the Objectors friends would have basely betray'd, at a time when they all lay at stake.* But what, I pray, have we done to deserve this charge? Truly we did not refuse to accept that liberty which King *James* granted us, contrary to law. I grant we did not; and 'tis the easiest thing in the world to defend our practice. For we accepted nothing of King *James*, but what we had a right to by the law of nature. But perhaps we went about treacherously to betray the Church of *England*; that Church, forsooth, that betray'd us over and over; that Church, which had long and sorely persecuted, and endeavour'd

* Isa. li. 23. † Luke xi. 46.

vour'd utterly to ruin us all, tho' we were quiet ſubjects, and Chriſtian brethren. But a ſhort relation of the matter will ſhew, whether we were for betraying them. Thus then the caſe ſtood: When we had obtain'd our liberty by King *James*'s Declaration, and his deſigns came every day more and more to light, and our old perſecutors began to fear, leſt we, being exaſperated by their former cruelties, ſhould fall in with the Papiſts in their meaſures; they of their own accord made application to us, earneſtly beſeeching us not to remember how they had formerly us'd us, for which they declar'd themſelves ſorry, laying the blame upon the Papiſts. They proteſted their earneſt deſire of peace, and promis'd they would take effectual care to remove every thing, which had hitherto hinder'd our union with them; if we would not hearken to the flatterers of the court, but heartily join with them in the choice of Parliament men, and it ſhould pleaſe God to deliver us from the danger we were then in. Without any more ado, and with a noble largeneſs of ſoul, we promis'd them. And as I have ſhewn out of Biſhop *Burnet*, we as bravely perform'd our promiſe, and were far from betraying them. But, to ſay the plain truth, their whole conduct ever ſince teſtifies, that they baſely betray'd us.

But why muſt the Church of England *alone be intereſted in ſtate controverſies? Why ſhould not either ſide, in matters of this nature, abound in their own ſenſe, provided they keep within the limits of their duty?* The Church of *England* is therefore *intereſted in theſe ſtate controverſies*, becauſe this doctrine was what they were oblig'd to aſſent to, and ſubſcribe: and therefore might not either ſide be taken, becauſe one ſide was both very falſe and pernicious.

Why ſhould the Conformiſts be more oblig'd to court the People, than Nonconformiſts are the Prince? * Both Conformiſts and Nonconformiſts are oblig'd to embrace the truth, and to inſtruct their Congregations therein. Wherefore, if that doctrine be true, the Conformiſts did well when they taught it their People; but they acted perfidiouſly, when they afterwards would teach them the contrary, and themſelves favour'd the expedition of the Prince of *Orange*. But if the doctrine is falſe, as none can be more ſo; then the ſpreaders, defenders, and ſubſcribers of it muſt be accounted men

* page 225.

men of great raſhneſs, who alſo threaten'd the ruin of the ſtate; and then muſt that Church be ſchiſmatical, which requir'd all her Miniſters to ſubſcribe a falſe doctrine, and turn'd out all thoſe who refus'd to do it. But our Author quite miſtakes the controverſy. For we ſay, the Conformiſts and Nonconformiſts are oblig'd to defend the juſt rights both of the King and People. And we deſervedly blame the Conformiſts, becauſe they endeavour'd to overthrow the rightful power of Parliaments.

During the reigns of King Charles I, *and* II, *when theſe matters were moſt warmly agitated, our great men were divided into parties.*

'Twas well for the nation they were not all out of their ſenſes; but that ſome were found, who had the public ſafety at heart. But what's this to the purpoſe? If *our great men were divided*, was it therefore lawful for your Clergy to ſpread falſe opinions, and teach the King to oppreſs his ſubjects, and to raiſe taxes without a Parliament? Was that reaſon enough for their aſſerting, that it belong'd to the King, as God's only deputy in the kingdom, to rule it juſt as he pleas'd; that however he oppreſs'd, plunder'd, or deſtroy'd his ſubjects, he was accountable to none but God; and that no one could reſiſt him, but under the penalty of eternal damnation?

Thoſe, who had the greateſt ſhare of the royal favour, were of courſe advanc'd to the higheſt offices. A fine excuſe! When the ſafety of the ſtate lies at ſtake, the Clergy conform themſelves juſt to the humour of the King and his courtiers, and deviſe and ſpread the moſt falſe and pernicious principles, to gratify them.

This ſtir'd the envy of the reſt againſt them, who ſpar'd for no plots and projects to diſmount them, and get into their places. If this were true, I dont ſee how it can be of any ſervice, to vindicate the Clergy in ſpreading wicked notions among the people. But this plea for the Clergy is injurious to our *great men*, and ſo to the nation itſelf. It repreſents one part of them, as vilely flattering the King, and currying favour with him, by claiming for him an unjuſt and tyrannical authority; and the other part of them, as oppoſing, indeed, the former; but doing it only out of *envy*, and with a deſire to *get into their places*. But I make no doubt we had many brave patriots among them, who, without any ſuch ſordid motives, endeavour'd to remove ſuch flattering courtiers from all places in the commonwealth, for no other reaſon,

but

but to prevent its receiving any prejudice by their administration.

To do this, they consider'd which way to strengthen their party: And what wonder? So men always us'd to do, when they see their native country in danger of being ruin'd. *and found no fitter tools, for their purpose, than the Nonconformists: these therefore they endeavour'd to gain by all the officious ways imaginable, as good words, kind looks, courteous behaviour, and a readiness to vote for them upon all occasions. In conversation with them, they freely exclaim'd against the management of public affairs. They pity'd their condition, that they should be so kept under, testifying their good wishes to have it otherwise, and promising to assist them with all the power and interest they had. These arts were soon perceiv'd by discerning men; and it became a rule with them to conclude, that as soon as any ambitious man was discharg'd at Court, he would presently appear at the head of the Dissenting party.*

'Tis no strange thing, if plain honest men are sometimes impos'd upon by the subtil and crafty. We deny not that we have been so serv'd sometimes. We know we were deluded not only by King *Charles* II, and his courtiers; but by the Clergy, who have been sometimes large in their promises to us, but sparing enough in performing them. But then we are not the only men, who have been thus deceiv'd: the Conformists, as cunning as they are, have been outwitted sometimes by the sly tricks of the Papists; and had they been only deluded by them, had they done no unjust acts themselves, we should not much blame them. The question now is: whether the Nonconformists, being impos'd upon by such courtiers, have fallen into evil opinions, or ever subscrib'd any such? If either Conformists, or Nonconformists obtain the favour of the King, or his courtiers, by honest methods, they are to be commended. But that Divines should conform themselves wholly, together with their opinions and sermons, to the pleasure of the King, or his courtiers, is very dishonourable. What is here said concerning the arts whereby they ingratiated themselves, *viz. by good words, kind looks, and courteous behaviour*, is the figment of his own brain, design'd for a rhetorical flourish, rather than a true historical account, and therefore deserves no answer. But they endeavour'd to *gain them* by *a readiness to vote for them upon all occasions.* In this they are to be commended; for they endeavour'd to gain those who abhorr'd tyranny,

tyranny, and the principles tending thereto; and who, being enemies to perſecution, ſhew'd themſelves zealous friends to the laws and liberties of our country. They, who have had the intereſt of their country at heart, have always been ready to vote in our favour. And if *they exclaim'd againſt the management of public affairs*, all impartial judges muſt allow, they had good reaſon for it. Nor can it be any wonder, that ſuch patrons of our civil liberties ſhould not be much in favour in the reigns of the two Brothers. But if from thoſe times we look to our own; to whom do they, who loſe King *George*'s favour, now apply themſelves, to the Nonconformiſts, or the high Churchmen? And if *they pitied our condition, and wiſh'd to have it otherwiſe*; the Conformiſts have no reaſon to be angry with them, unleſs it be for having more of humanity left in them, than they had themſelves.

Now, if they blame our ſide for being too much devoted to our princes, have not we as great reaſon at leaſt to complain of them, that they yield themſelves ſo tamely to be manag'd by ſeditious heads, and are ſo commonly brought on the ſtage to embroil affairs? * But who are thoſe *ſeditious heads*, refer'd to? and what *ſedition* have they rais'd? Our Author has contriv'd theſe things of his own head, and they are unworthy of a formal confutation.

But we are ſo far from denying it, that we rather glory in aſſerting, the magiſtrate's power to be from God, and not deriv'd from the people, nor dependent on their pleaſure.

No body doubts, that the juſt power of the magiſtrate is from God; for that power, which the gentlemen who write about Government aſcribe to magiſtrates, they ſuppoſe to have been plac'd in the hands of all in a ſtate of nature. That therefore magiſtrates in general ſhould have power, and that they ſhould enact laws for the good of the ſociety, is acknowledg'd to be *deriv'd from God*, the fountain of all natural light and knowledge. But that this power was at firſt given by him to ſome particular perſons, to be handed down by them to others, by an hereditary right of ſucceſſion; and that theſe perſons ſhould have a right, tranſcendent to all rules of common equity, to ſpoil, or murder their ſubjects, and be accountable to none for what they do; theſe are the things we deny. If the people

* *page* 227.

people give that power to Kings, which they themſelves have receiv'd of God, that power of Kings may then well be ſaid to be *deriv'd from God:* but we maintain, that an abſolute and tyrannical power was never given by God to the people; nor to Kings, either by God, or the people. If our Adverſaries have any arguments to prove, that kingly power belongs to ſome individual perſons, as beſtow'd upon them by a divine grant, without any regard to the election or conſent of the people, we are ready to hear them. But ſince we only allow of reſiſtance in the caſe of an unjuſt and tyrannical government, and our Author himſelf pretends not to defend ſuch an one; theſe things are very little to our purpoſe. And unleſs Kings are made by the people, by whom, I beſeech you, muſt they be ſuppos'd to be made? Where ſhall we ſearch for thoſe inſtruments or records, in which God has particularly ſpecify'd the perſons to whom he has delegated this regal power? And if we muſt herein be directed by the providence of God, how ſhall we be able to diſtinguiſh a rightful King from an uſurper? In a word, ſince God has neither appointed, by any law, a particular form of government; nor particularly mark'd out the perſons, who are to be magiſtrates, every people is left at full liberty to chuſe both.

The contrary doctrine, that all government is founded in I know not what original contract between prince and people, is not only ridiculous, but impious, and flows from the impure ſource of Epicurean *philoſophy.*

That *original contract*, our Author ſpeaks ſo ſlightly of, deſerv'd to be treated with more reſpect. For if there were no ſuch thing, how could King *James* II. forfeit his regal authority? or, by what right could the good people of *England* reſiſt him, and ſettle the crown upon King *William* and Queen *Mary*? or upon what pretence could he ſwear allegiance to them? Our Convention Parliament, before they ſettled the crown upon them, declar'd that King *James* had broken the *original contract* between him and his people. If then, there never was any ſuch contract, how could he break it? and how could the *Engliſh* ſcepter be juſtly put into any other hand? So that if we conſider upon what foundation the right of King *William* and Queen *Mary*, Queen *Anne*, and his preſent Majeſty King *George*, is built; we muſt acknowledge 'tis no other than this, that 'tis lawful for a people to reſiſt a King who breaks

breaks the *original contract*, and to set another in his room. But no marvel if some of the old leaven yet remains, since the whole body of the Clergy were not long since leaven'd with it. But this may be some comfort to us, that their trifling sophistry will avail but little with them, as soon as they find themselves in danger. For I believe no one doubts, we should then presently see them renew their former practice, and provide for their safety, as they did in King *James*'s time, by resistance; and that, notwithstanding all their boasting in the pulpit, or the press. For these plain-dealers have the art of varying their doctrines, and shifting their principlesaccording to the times, and as they find themselves to be in safety, or in danger. But this is *ridiculous*. By all means! 'Tis *ridiculous* the King should not be above all laws, and not have it in his power to destroy the commonwealth, for the good of which alone he is made King. But our wise ancestors were of another opinion; and unless they had, by such a contract, set some bounds to the regal power, how could the people have secur'd any of their rights and liberties? And how comes it to pass, that we require our Kings to swear to maintain these in their Coronation Oath? But this is *impious, and flows from the impure source of* Epicurean *philosophy*. And will our Adversaries thus accuse the most noble Assembly, that preserv'd our religion, our liberty, and our commonwealth; and to whom we are indebted for the reign of such excellent Princes? Will they, I say, accuse them of adopting an *impious* opinion, out of the *philosophy* of *Epicurus*? Will they do it, who have sworn to their settlement of our Constitution? I refer those who are thus minded to Mr. *Lock*, our noblest writer upon the subject of Government. I refer them to Bishop *Hoadley*, commended elsewhere by our Author himself, who has excellently defended our opinion. And I may well call it ours; for we differ not at all, from that which he maintains; while the Nonjurors (whose Opinion was formerly embrac'd by the generality of the *English* Clergy) are most bitterly inrag'd against him. And why should he object against us, *Epicurean* principles, who is so displeas'd with the charge of Popish ones? If *Epicurus* jumbled some mistakes and some truths together, must we upon that account reject the truths? We take another course in natural philosophy; why should we not do the like in politics and ethics?

And if *Epicurus*, as *Diogenes Laertius* reports, held there was nothing juſt or unjuſt in itſelf, but by virtue of covenants, which men have enter'd into, he widely differs from our opinion. But what need I uſe many words about this? Theſe, and the reſt of the idle cavils here uſed, have been long ago anſwer'd by the moſt learned and ingenious Mr. *Lock*, to whom I refer all thoſe for ſatisfaction, who think there is any ſtrength in them.

At length the Doctor aſks: *And as for tyranny, what do we advance to encourage it?** We ſhall preſently be able to anſwer this queſtion from his own confeſſion. *ſince a man may be very loyal* [in the *Latin* 'tis, *to good princes*: and he that is not loyal to them, deſerves the ſevereſt puniſhment] *and yet far from being fond of a mercileſs tyrant.* No man in his wits will think theſe things to be contrary to one another; or make any difficulty of allowing with our Author, that *we ſee at this day many brave men, employ'd by our excellent Queen, and very dutiful and loyal to her, who had formerly ſignaliz'd themſelves in the defence of their liberties againſt arbitrary power.* Nevertheleſs, we may ſay, we ſee others who little regard whether Princes rule well or tyrannically; but only conſider how they ſtand affected to themſelves, and their intereſt; and accordingly either reverence, or hate them.

But theſe things are only a flouriſh before hand; and now we come to the main combat. Hear then from our Author our true objection: *But ſome of us declar'd not long ſince, both in preaching and writing, that it was not lawful to reſiſt the Prince's officers, though commanded by him to act in the moſt arbitrary manner.* † And now I appeal to the honeſt verdict of our Judges, whether what the Clergy herein *advanc'd, encourag'd tyranny*, or no? See now, how he anſwers.

It may be remember'd that they expreſs'd themſelves thus, at a time when the royal authority was warmly diſputed; when popular fury, inflam'd by factious men, was very threatning and dangerous both to Church and State: But it ſhould be remember'd, that matter had never been diſputed, and much more not ſo warmly, had not mercenary Clergymen firſt taught both Prince and people that baſe doctrine. This there-

---

* *page* 232. † *page* 132.

therefore is a very sorry defence. For what? Is it lawful for the Clergy to spread false and mischievous opinions, when there is a warm dispute a foot? Certainly the warmer the dispute, the more need there is of caution. But supposing this will serve, if not to vindicate, yet to excuse in some measure the Clergy, in what they did in King *Charles* the First's time; what shall we then say concerning his Son's reign? The Clergy did not less industriously propagate that notion in King *Charles* the Second's days; altho' no *popular fury, inflam'd by factious men, was then very threatning and dangerous both to Church and State.* In truth, ever since this doctrine began to be preach'd, it has brought the State into danger. And if the people of *England* had regarded that kind of preachers, and been loyal to King *James* II. as they directed them; every one is sensible, what a condition we must have been in long ago. So that it must be own'd, they either impos'd horridly upon the Prince, or the people. But he goes on: *and when the Parliament had enacted a law, that none should take arms against the King's officers for any cause whatever; which Law every Clergyman was bound to subscribe at his Ordination.* So then any thing (no matter whether true or false) may be subscrib'd, if the Parliament requires it. I beseech now our Brethren abroad, to say plainly, whether this subscription of the Conformists was not unlawful and impious? Whether the terms of Conformity were not in this respect unjust? Whether those Ministers are not to be esteem'd the rightful and catholic Pastors of the Church, who chose rather to be turn'd out of their livings, than submit to such conditions of keeping them? And lastly, whether those Ministers are not to be esteem'd schismatical, and to have come in at a wrong door, who got their livings by such unrighteous methods? If any unlawful terms of Conformity are requir'd, they are Schismatics, in the judgment of many of the Episcoparians themselves, not who refuse, but who submit to them. And I would be glad to know, how the Conformists can in this respect clear themselves from the guilt of Schism.

And now is it such an unpardonable crime for the Clergy, who are not suppos'd to understand state affairs, to defend a matter so expressly and solemnly establish'd by the laws? And is this the defence we were made to expect of the behaviour of the Clergy? Who can do otherwise than call it a poor and

ſorry excuſe, or rather a begging of pardon? For if the Clergy *underſtand not ſtate affairs*, why did they meddle with them? Why did they pretend great ſkill in them? But they treated not of this as a *ſtate affair*, but as a point of religion. Whoſe indignation does not riſe, when he calls to mind with what arrogance they preach'd this pernicious doctrine, as tho' it had been unqueſtionable Goſpel; and thunder'd out the threatnings of eternal torments againſt all thoſe who contradicted it? Further, if it be lawful to *defend* any *matter*, which is *expreſly and ſolemnly eſtabliſh'd by the laws*, without conſidering, whether it be true, or falſe; what is there, that may not ſome time or other be capable of the ſame defence? By the ſame argument our Adverſaries may excuſe the Clergy, who embrac'd and defended Popery in Queen *Mary*'s days: 'twas *a matter as expreſly and ſolemnly eſtabliſh'd by the laws.*

Next our Author endeavours to remove the blame from the Clergy, and lay it elſewhere. *Why*, ſays he, *dont the blame (if any be due) fall upon the grave and wiſe authors of ſuch a law*? No doubt, the blame falls upon the lawmakers; but it falls alſo upon thoſe who firſt taught thoſe *grave and wiſe* perſons the doctrine, and afterward defended it with as much zeal and earneſtneſs, as if it had been the principal and moſt important point of their religion. *Were the Clergy oblig'd to ſubſcribe one thing, and teach people another*? No certainly. But ſince the doctrine it ſelf was poiſonous, they ought not to have approv'd it by their ſubſcription. But ſome men, to curry favour, ſtick not at any ſubſcription, or oath the Parliament requires, and then ſtun the poor people with their noiſe about it. They have their reaſons for what they do. *The Laws expreſly and ſolemnly require it*; and they muſt obey men, rather than God. But he farther aſks: *If the high eſtates of the kingdom were willing to give away the people's rights and privileges, was it reaſonable to expect that a company of helpleſs Prieſts ſhould defend them*? They ſhould have defended them, as our not leſs *helpleſs* Miniſters did, who refus'd to ſubſcribe the doctrine; and as they afterwards defended them themſelves, in the reign of King *James* II. 'Tis one thing not to be able to defend the rights and privileges of the people, and another perfidiouſly to betray them. The Parliament hearken'd to the advice and deſire of the Clergy,

in

in making that, and ſeveral other laws; and are now worthily rewarded for their complaiſance: for the Clergy, to excuſe themſelves, now throw all the blame upon them.

Thus I have conſider'd all in this Part, which I think is material in our controverſy. I ſhall next conſider his other Part; wherein we ſhall ſee how ſtout a defence he makes of the Hierarchy and Ceremonies of the Church of *England*.

A

VINDICATION

OF THE

DISSENTERS.

PART III.

In which Dr. NICHOLS's Second Part, vindicating the Church of *England*'s Diſcipline, and Modes of Worſhip, is examin'd and refuted.

CHAP. I.

Of the Government of Biſhops.

THE former part of the Doctor's Defence has been eaſily diſpatch'd, it containing little material in our controverſy. For *Calviniſm* is ſo far from ever hindring men from ſubſcribing the Articles, that they can't honeſtly be ſubſcrib'd without it. But now we are come to the very heart of the controverſy. The Diſſenters uſed not to charge the authentic writings of the Church with errors in doctrine; but only ſome particular

ticular authors, who have made innovations in the doctrine they subscrib'd. But we do indeed blame the Church (how very deservedly our Arbitrators shall now see) for her establish'd discipline, and modes of worship. Our author begins this part of his Defence with the vindication of the Hierarchy. And since his party never write with more assurance and triumph, upon any point of the controversy, than this; nay, since abundance of them use to condemn all the Reformed Churches abroad, as well as the Dissenters at home, for laying aside Episcopacy; I think 'twill not be amiss here, in the first place, to give a particular account of the opinion of the two contending parties.

The episcopal party then, altho' they are greatly divided about the original and foundation of their Hierarchy; yet the generality of them, especially the moderns, are stiff in maintaining a threefold order of Ministers. To the lowest order, of Deacons, a power is granted of baptizing; of reading in the congregation the Holy Scriptures, Homilies, and Prayers; of assisting the Priests in distributing the elements of the Lord's Supper; and of preaching, if the Bishop thinks fit, upon any part of the New Testament. The care of the poor is likewise committed to them in shew, but not in reality. The middle order, of Priests, or Presbyters, is allow'd to preach, read Prayers, administer Sacraments, and pronounce the Absolution. To the highest order, of Bishops, (of which there is but one in each Church) belongs the power of confirming baptiz'd persons, ordaining Ministers, and governing the Church. They look upon the Bishop's Dioceſs, as the lowest *species* or kind of a Church, and lodge the whole government of every Church in its respective Bishop; but the Presbyters, who officiate in the several parishes, which make up the Bishop's Dioceſs, are look'd upon as his delegates or Curates. This part of the controversy was considerably alter'd in the last Century. Our most antient Reformers thought, there was no difference, by divine appointment, between a Bishop and a Presbyter; and therefore requir'd not those, who had been ordain'd by Presbyters, to be reordain'd by a Bishop, to qualify them for discharging the office of a Presbyter in the Church of *England*.

As to our part, we do not condemn all manner of precedence, or preheminence. If the Episcoparians had only asserted it to be both lawful and useful, that among Presbyters, who are by the first institution all equal, there should

be one, for order ſake, placed above the reſt, and call'd the Biſhop, we ſhould not upon that account have contended with them, or ſeparated from them. Who knows not that the Foreign Churches, which are under Presbyterian government, have, in their Synods and Claſſes, Moderators, Prolocutors, &c. which are by experience found neceſſary? And if men had been intruſted with thoſe offices in our Churches, not barely upon occaſion, but for life, or as long as they behav'd themſelves well in them, I hardly think any quarrel would have riſen upon this head. Nay, ſo earneſtly did our Miniſters deſire peace, that if our Biſhops had been oblig'd to govern their Churches, with the conſent and aſſiſtance of their Presbyters, they would have born with it, rather than have been depriv'd of the public exerciſe of their Miniſtry. For they thus conſider'd with themſelves; that it was enough for them, if they preſerv'd intire the power which they receiv'd from God, and left that conſecration, whereby Presbyters are made Biſhops, as a uſeleſs thing, to thoſe who were ſatisfy'd of the lawfulneſs or expediency of it. This then is our judgment; that the diſtinction our Adverſaries make between a Presbyter and a Biſhop is groundleſs, being no where made in the Scripture; and that Chriſt is alone a monarch in his Church; and that he has never appointed a Monarchical form of government to be practis'd in it.

'Tis not needful, that I ſhould uſe many arguments to confirm this our opinion. I refer my *Engliſh* readers to my Letters againſt Dr. *Wells*. They will there meet with a full proof of our opinion, ſuch as my adverſary could not anſwer; who contented himſelf with denying the concluſion, without replying to the premiſes; and miſerably teaz'd his poor readers with an endleſs repetition of a tale of the ambiguous, and promiſcuous uſe, of the names Biſhop and Presbyter.

And as to our Brethren abroad, who are all of the ſame opinion with us; I would not be thought to doubt of their being fully acquainted with all thoſe arguments, which defend an opinion as much theirs as our own. Otherwiſe I might mention, that our Bleſſed Saviour at his aſcenſion left an Ariſtocratical form of government in his Church at *Jeruſalem*, the only one he then had upon earth; and committed to his eleven Apoſtles an equal power in governing it. I might mention, that the ſame form of government obtain'd at *Epheſus*, *Corinth*, *Theſſalonica*, *Philippi*, and

all

all other Churches mention'd in the New Teſtament. I might mention the Apoſtle *Paul*'s expreſs aſcribing the Ordination of *Timothy* to the Presbytery. I might mention, that there is no where the leaſt notice taken in the New Teſtament of any ſuch ſacred office, as had the power of adminiſtring Sacraments; but not of ruling the Church, and ordaining Miniſters. Laſtly, I might mention, that two orders of Miniſters only are ſpoken of in the Holy Scripture, and that ſo much as the name of a third does not there appear. The learned Bp. *Burnet* was aware of ſome inconſiſtency in the contrary notion. I ſhall ſet down his words, which are very much to my purpoſe. "As for the notion, *ſays he*, "of the diſtinct offices of Biſhop and Presbyter, I confeſs, "'tis not ſo clear to me: and therefore ſince I look upon the "ſacramental actions, as the higheſt of ſacred performances; I cannot but acknowledge, thoſe who are impower'd "for them, muſt be of the higheſt office in the Church."* For the ſake of brevity, I paſs over theſe, and a great many other things, which ſhew, the form of government, ſettled in the Foreign Churches, does much better agree with the Scriptures, than that of the Church of *England*. And if the opinion, which is common to us with our Brethren abroad, be true; he muſt certainly invade the rights of Presbyters, and affect a very unjuſt authority, who endeavours to appropriate to himſelf all power in the Church, to the excluſion of the Presbyters. But let us now hear our Author, who, when he has ſet down our objections, preſently proceeds after this faſhion.

But let theſe unrighteous accuſers know, that the Order they ſo loudly declaim againſt, was inſtituted by Chriſt himſelf; who, juſt before his aſcenſion, inſpir'd his Apoſtles with the Holy Ghoſt, and gave them power to remit and retain ſins; which Apoſtles were Biſhops both in name and thing. † Theſe things are very eaſily anſwer'd. For,

1. According to the judgment of the Epiſcoparians, a Biſhop and a Church go together, and are *relata*, as Logicians would call them: and there can be but one Biſhop in a Church. Since therefore there was at that time but one Chriſtian Church, there could likewiſe be but one Biſhop, according to their own ſcheme; and yet eleven Biſhops are by our Lord plac'd in it, all endow'd with an equal ſhare of

* Vindicat. of the Church of *Scotl. page* 310. † *page* 236.

of honour and authority. I have always thought that first Church at *Jerusalem*, founded by our Lord himself, was the best platform for us to model our Churches by. She was deservedly call'd by the Fathers, in the Synod of *Constantinople*, the Mother Church; * and by *Ireneus*, the Metropolis of the citizens of the New Covenant. † And to the like purpose is that of *Tertullian*: "Every kind must be reckon'd "according to its original: therefore so many and great "Churches are that one Church, first founded by the "Apostles, from which all others are deriv'd. So they are "all the first Church, and all Apostolical Churches, while "they all together demonstrate their being one." ‖ A Church is to be esteem'd the more pure and perfect, the more conform'd 'tis to its original. But all grant the Church of *Jerusalem* was the original of all the rest: and therefore *Jerom*'s comment is not amiss, upon those words of the Prophet: *For the law shall go forth out of* Sion, *and the word of the Lord out of* Jerusalem. "The Church "first founded in *Jerusalem*, *says he*, bred all the other "Churches thro' the whole world — He does not say, *the* "*Law shall be*, or *remain in Sion*, or *in Jerusalem*, but shall "*go forth* from thence; that he might tell us, all nations "were to be water'd with the Christian doctrine flowing "from that fountain." ‡ And since it cannot be deny'd, that the Apostles had all equal power in that first Church; I can't see what can be wanting to make this a full and clear demonstration of our opinion.

2. We readily grant, the Apostles were all Bishops; for we say, all Presbyters are such. Two things are to be consider'd in the Apostles: First, their Apostleship, or what was peculiar to them, not to be deriv'd down to any successors: Secondly, their ordinary office, wherein they were to be succeeded by others; it being design'd to continue to the end of the world. Our Author should have prov'd, the Apostles were Bishops according to the model of our *English* Hierarchy; or that, with reference to their ordinary capacity, they were not of the same order with Presbyters. The Apostles never disdain'd or shun'd the name of Presbyters: 1 *Pet.* v. 1, 2. 2 *Epistle* of *John* 1. 3 *Epistle* of *John* 1. And as far as I can perceive, that name in the Holy Scripture

* Theodorit. H. E. *lib.* v. *c.* 9. † *Book* iii. *c.* 12 *p.* 226.
‖ De Præscr. *c.* 20. ‡ *Upon* Isa. ii. 3.

ture always signifies such Ministers as were more than one, and equal in power in every particular Church. I therefore willingly grant, Christ instituted then the order of Bishops or Presbyters: the order, I say, it being but one, since a Bishop and a Presbyter always signify the same thing in the New Testament. And let our Adversaries, if they can, shew us the institution of any other order, than this one, and that of Deacons, in the Holy Scripture.

Before I dismiss this matter, 'twill not be amiss to look into our Author's marginal observation, whereby he would confirm what I have now refuted.

Upon which the author of the Questions on the Old and New Testament *has a pertinent remark*: "Every body knows, our "Lord ordain'd Bishops to preside over the Churches. Be- "fore he ascended into Heaven, he laid his hands on his "Apostles, and ordain'd them Bishops."

The book is divided into 127 questions; and it had been easy therefore for our Author to refer his reader to the particular question, where he might find his citation. I complain'd of this in the *Latin* edition; but 'tis not mended in the Translation. I could not, upon a second search, readily find the place, and did not think it worth while to look very diligently for it. For whatever the Doctor might imagine, I can't see 'tis much to his purpose. Who doubts, the Apostles were by our Lord ordain'd Bishops? We assert not only that; but likewise that there were no other, of whatever order or degree, ordain'd by him. Further, since that Author is known to have been of opinion, that there is no difference between a Bishop and a Presbyter, except that a Bishop is the first Presbyter; and since a Bishop and a Presbyter in Scripture are the very same; who perceives not, that the testimony here alledg'd is very contrary to our Author's judgment? Mind how he discourses elsewhere: "The Apostle *Paul* shews, that by Presbyter is meant a "Bishop, when he gives directions to *Timothy*, whom he "had ordain'd a Presbyter, what were the qualifications of "any person, whom he should ordain a Bishop. For what "indeed is a Bishop, but the first (or chief) Presbyter, "that is, the chief Priest? Lastly, a Bishop calls the Pres- "byters his Fellow Presbyters, or his Fellow Priests. Does "he in like manner call his Deacons, his Fellow Deacons? "By no means; because they are much inferior to him. "And 'tis not decent for the chief Judge to speak in that "manner. For in *Alexandria*, and through all *Egypt*, in the

"absence

" abſence of the Biſhop, a Presbyter conſecrates." * By conſecrating here, he can't mean conſecrating the elements in the Lord's Supper; ſince that was the cuſtom every where, as well as in *Egypt*; and therefore he muſt refer to Confirmation or Ordination. And if learned men are not miſtaken in their conjecture, that *Hilary* the Deacon was the writer of that piece, and the *Commentary upon St.* Paul's *Epiſtles*, which uſed to be aſcrib'd to St. *Ambroſe*; he is known to have held, there was but *one Ordination of a Biſhop, and a Presbyter.* † But if any doubts of his opinion, let him conſult Mr. *Blondel*, who has well explain'd it. ‖

But I return again from our Author's Margin to his Text. *Which Apoſtles were Biſhops both in name and thing, and fix'd their Sees in the chief cities, which they had converted.* ‡

Becauſe the Apoſtles were inſpir'd perſons, and ready on all occaſions to declare the will of God, the Churches were bound to obey them: and ſo there can be no doubt, they govern'd the Churches, wherever they came. But that they *fix'd their Sees in* any *chief cities*, or commonly reſided in them, as the ordinary governors of the Churches therein, may be very much queſtion'd. Nay, the moſt learned Dr. *Barrow* (*a Man who* may be allow'd to have *a ſmall ſhare of modeſty*, at leaſt, notwithſtanding what our Author preſently ſays to the contrary) denies it, and endeavours to overthrow that opinion by ſeveral arguments, in his incomparable piece concerning *The Pope's Supremacy*. * If the antients ſeem to ſay any thing contrary to this, I ſhould be ready to think, 'tis to be attributed to their fondneſs for their own reſpective Churches; as it was uſual for them to endeavour to advance the reputation of their Churches, by fetching their original from ſome famous Apoſtle, as tho' he had been the Biſhop thereof. So *Peter* is pretended to have been firſt Biſhop of *Antioch*, and afterwards of *Rome*, and to have ordain'd his ſucceſſors in both Churches. And if that were true, I dont ſee why it was reckon'd of old ſo ſcandalous, for a Biſhop to leave a poor See for a rich one; or why it was look'd upon unlawful for a Biſhop to ordain his own ſucceſſor, that is, to make two Biſhops or Monarchs in one Church. In a word, we grant, the Apoſtles ordain'd others to be Presbyters in the ſeveral Churches; but that they appointed alſo Biſhops of a different order from Preſbyters,

* *Queſt.* 101. † *In* 1 Tim. iii. ‖ Apol. *p.* 47, &c. ‡ *page* 237. * *p.* 82, &c.

byters, will never be prov'd by thoſe who earneſtly deſire to do it. But I ſhall afterwards ſhew how the Apoſtles behav'd themſelves, out of St. *Clement*, who was cotemporary with them.

And our Author's buſineſs is not to ſhew, the Apoſtles, as he ſays, *ordain'd others, as occaſion requir'd*, which every body allows; but to prove they ordain'd them to be eccleſiaſtical Monarchs, or each of them ſingly to rule their reſpective Churches; for that is what we abſolutely deny. Nor is this queſtion to be decided by the teſtimonies of Fathers, but by the Holy Scriptures. Who can make it appear, that *Cyprian*, *Theodorit*, or *Rabanus Maurus*, are a ſure rule, by which we may diſcover the truth? Our Adverſaries reject their authority when they pleaſe; why then may not we do the ſame, as often as they diſagree with the Holy Scripture? Nor are the words of *Cyprian* over fairly cited. They are thus: "The Deacons ſhould remember, that the "Lord choſe the Apoſtles, that is, Biſhops and Rulers; "but the Apoſtles, after our Lord's aſcenſion into heaven, "appointed the Deacons, as their own and the Church's "ſervants." * 'Tis to be obſerv'd, *Cyprian* does not ſay, the Biſhops and Rulers are Apoſtles; as our Author, inverting the words in his citation, pretends. He does not ſay, *Epiſcopos & Præpoſitos* (*i. e. Apoſtolos*) *Dominus elegit*, as our Author ſets down his words; but *Apoſtolos*, *i. e. Epiſcopos & Præpoſitos*. The reaſon of his expreſſion is, becauſe the Apoſtles, beſides their extraordinary character of Apoſtleſhip (which was peculiar to themſelves, and was not to deſcend to any perſons after them) ſuſtain'd the character of ordinary Biſhops or Presbyters. So that whatever rights, privileges, or promiſes, belong'd to the Apoſtles by virtue of their ordinary character, are underſtood in like manner to belong to all Biſhops or Rulers. Moreover, ſince *Cyprian* acknowledges but one office, *viz.* that of the Apoſtles, to be inſtituted by Chriſt; and the other, of the Deacons, to be appointed by the Apoſtles; and yet diſtinguiſhes a Preſbyter from a Biſhop; he muſt, without all doubt, have believ'd, that Biſhops and Presbyters were both ſucceſſors to the Apoſtles. 'Tis not unuſual with *Ireneus* † to ſpeak in that manner, ſometimes of Presbyters, and ſometimes of Biſhops. Wherefore, I can't but think, *Cyprian*'s meaning is;

* *Ep.* 65. † *Compare Lib.* ii. *c.* 2, 3, & iv. *c.* 43.

is; that Christ at that time appointed the offices of Bishop and Presbyter. Compare herewith the Epistle of his cotemporary and acquaintance *Firmilian*, which is thought to be *Cyprian*'s own translation out of the *Greek*. " 'Tis our " constant practice, that every year we all, Elders and " Rulers, meet together, to order those affairs, which are " committed to our care. * — All authority and grace is " lodg'd in the Church, where Presbyters [*majoris natu*] " bear rule, who have the power of baptizing, confirming, " and ordaining. "† Now if this was *Cyprian*'s opinion, that Christ instituted Bishops and Presbyters, when he instituted his Apostles; what signifies it against us, unless our Adversaries can prove, that Christ then appointed some difference between them?

But *Theodorit*'s testimony is next produced, who says: *that those, who are now call'd Bishops, were formerly call'd Apostles.*‖ A mighty business! This is the conjecture of *Theodorit*, a Bishop of the fifth Century; which he does not confirm by the testimony of any more antient Father, but only grounds it on the words of the Apostle. If there be no force in his argument (as I will shew presently there is not, when I come to speak of *Epaphroditus*) 'tis evident his authority can signify nothing in this case. And of less account is the judgment of *Rabanus Maurus*, who liv'd in the ninth Century, and should rather be reckon'd among the late than the antient writers.

But our Author now tells us when, and upon what occasion, the Apostles ordain'd others; *viz. when the bounds of the Church were so enlarg'd, that there was need of greater numbers to preach the Gospel.* And was this the occasion of their ordaining more Bishops? Let then the Church of *England* be asham'd, which commits so many thousand souls in *England*, and both the *Indies*, to the single care of the Bishop of *London*. One Bishop is now thought sufficient for so vast a Diocess; why then might not twelve Apostles have been enough for the whole Christian world? For if the number of souls committed to the care of that one Bishop, be multiplied by the number of the Apostles; the Product, I dare say, will not only equal, but far exceed the number of all the Christians in the world at that time. And yet I hope I *may have a small share of modesty*, tho' I say, any one of the Apostles

---

* *page* 219. † *page* 221. ‖ *Upon* 1 Tim. iii.

Apoſtles was as capable of governing ſo large a Church, as the Biſhop of *London*.

This eminent honour and dignity was confer'd on James *ſurnam'd the* Juſt, *who preſided over the Church of* Jeruſalem *many years with great ſanctity and wiſdom.* Juſt now he pretended this order and dignity commenc'd at the *aſcenſion of Chriſt*, when he *inſpir'd the Apoſtles with the Holy Ghoſt*: and now he ſuppoſes this *honour and dignity* to be *confer'd* upon *James*, who was an Apoſtle before. And ſo at length the Biſhops, the ſucceſſors of the Apoſtles, are advanc'd above their predeceſſors. Many ſtrange tales are related by the antients of this *James*. *Photius* ſays, he receiv'd his Conſecration, and the Biſhoprick of *Jeruſalem*, from our Lord's own hand. * *Nicephorus Calliſtus* makes him to have the Church of *Jeruſalem* committed to him, firſt by our Saviour himſelf, and afterward (as ſome ſay) by the Apoſtles. †

If any one imagines our cauſe hurt by the teſtimonies of the antients concerning this *James*; we deſire him to take notice, that we little regard that ſtory, which they borrow'd from *Hegeſippus*; which is ſo ſilly, childiſh and falſe, that hardly any ſenſible perſon, whether Proteſtant or Papiſt, now gives any heed to it. If any one deſires to ſee it confuted, he may conſult the famous *Scaliger*, ‖ who has demonſtrated many falſities to be contain'd in it. I will not tranſcribe his obſervations, but juſt mention ſome of the ſilly fabulous accounts he gives of him.

1. *Hegeſippus* relates, that the Scribes and Phariſees carry'd this *James* up to the top of the Temple of *Jeruſalem*; that from thence he might undeceive the people, who believ'd Jeſus was the Chriſt. Now, who can credit this Story? A Man may well ſay the Scribes and Phariſees were abominably wicked; but no man in his wits will be eaſily perſwaded to believe they were ſo ſilly and ſtupid, as to expect that *James*, our Saviour's Brother, Diſciple, and Apoſtle, ſhould thus blaſphemouſly ſpeak againſt him before the People, when they could not prevail with him firſt to do it more privately before themſelves? This would be as tho' a man ſhould hope to

* *Epiſt.* 117. *pag.* 158. † *Lib.* 11. *c.* 38. *pag.* 196.
‖ Animadv. in Euſeb. Chronol. *pag.* 178. Valeſii Not. in Euſeb.

to perſuade the Pope to go up St. *Peter*'s Church at *Rome*, and thence tell the people, they ſhould no longer take him for Chriſt's Vicar on earth, but for the Antichriſt foretold in the Scripture.

2. He gives an account, that *James* was thrown headlong from the top of that high Temple, and preſently kneel'd down and pray'd, and was then knock'd on the head by a Fuller with his club, and buried in the ſame place. But who can be ignorant, that the *Jews* (who knew any dead body defil'd, according to their law, not only men, but holy places) would ſuffer no body to be buried within their city, and much leſs ſo near the Temple? They would therefore never ſuffer *James*, whom with deadly hatred they had juſt before wickedly murder'd, to be buried in that very holy ground.

3. Laſtly, that trifler adds; that his monument, or tombſtone remain'd in the ſame place to his time. But this could not be without a new miracle. For when the Temple was deſtroy'd, according to our Saviour's prediction, *one ſtone was not left upon another*. How then could this monument of *James* be preſerv'd ſafe in that prodigious deſtruction? Away with ſuch impertinencies! He that can feign ſuch tales, or believe them when feign'd to his hand, hardly deſerves any credit himſelf. Upon the whole therefore, what ſatisfaction can we have of *James*'s Epiſcopacy, from the relation of ſuch an author?

But ſome may perhaps here object: What then, will you give no credit to ſo many conſiderable eccleſiaſtical writers, who unanimouſly agree in making this *James* Biſhop of *Jeruſalem*? Truly, I think they will not have much wrong done them hereby; if, as it ſeems very probable, they owe their accounts, both of the Biſhoprick and Martyrdom of *James*, only to *Hegeſippus*. But that I may ſpeak my mind honeſtly and freely; ſince *Jeruſalem* was a famous city, and the metropolis both of *Jews* and Chriſtians, and very much frequented by both; it might perhaps ſeem convenient and neceſſary to the Apoſtles, that one of their own number ſhould always continue there. If therefore any one ſhould contend, that *James* the *Juſt*, upon ſome ſuch account fix'd his reſidence there, and ſo became the chief teacher and ruler of that Church, and that hence the antients took occaſion to call him the Biſhop of *Jeruſalem*; I ſhould not in the leaſt

oppoſe

oppose him. But lest any one should think, I am paving the way hereby to a Monarchical Church government, I add: that an Apostle had a greater share in Church administrations than a common Presbyter, not by virtue of any ordinary character he bore, and was to be transmitted to successors; but by virtue of his extraordinary character, as immediately chosen by Christ, and immediately inspir'd by the Holy Ghost. Nor can I believe, the power of governing that Church was committed to *James* alone; the other Apostles being excluded, when present. He could do nothing, which might not be done by any of the rest of them. And if you consider him as an Apostle, he vastly differs from a Bishop; but if you consider him as an ordinary Minister of the New Testament, so he was a Presbyter, as were the rest of the Apostles: nor was he alone intrusted with the government of that Church in the absence of the Apostles, but had other Presbyters join'd with him therein, who, as Presbyters, were equal to him in all things, except the election of our Lord himself. I should have done with the Bishop of *Jerusalem*, but that I must take notice of what he here adds: That he *had St.* Stephen, *the first Martyr, for his Deacon, as the Fathers inform us.*

This I dont believe. I think 'tis plain, as I elsewhere observe, that our Lord made *Peter* the chief Apostle, and that he acted as such, while the Apostles kept all together, as they did till some time after *Stephen*'s death. And we find not any thing peculiar mention'd of this *James* in the *Acts*, till after that time. *James* did not go to *Samaria* to give them the Holy Ghost, as probably he would have done, had he been in the chair at *Jerusalem*; but *Peter* and *John* are sent for that purpose. So that tho' I should allow *James* to have afterwards been in that See; yet I cannot easily do it, during St. *Stephen*'s life. But who are those *Fathers*, who thus *inform us*? We are here refer'd to *Ignat. Ep. ad Trall.* But what's the meaning of this? A sorry knave, and a corrupter of the Fathers, is reckon'd among the holy Fathers themselves. For the passage, here refer'd to, is not in the genuine Epistle of *Ignatius*, but is the addition of the Interpolator. Either therefore that impostor is too much lov'd and honour'd, or else the Doctor despis'd not only the Dissenters, but the Foreign Divines his Judges, as unlearned and stupid wretches, whom he hoped to impose upon in so plain a case.

With the same honourable office was Epaphroditus *invested, as St.* Paul *testifies; whom for that reason* Theodorit *and St.* Jerom *stile Bishop of the* Philippians. *

The titles of the Ministers of the New Testament are sometimes used by the sacred Penmen in their common signification. Thus the word διάκονος, *Deacon*, sometimes signifies any servant; and πρεσβύτερος, *Presbyter*, an old man. In like manner, ἀπόστολος sometimes is put for any messenger, or person sent by another, *John* xiii. 16. Not only foreign Interpreters, but our own, so render the word in that place, and in 2 *Cor.* viii. 23. as also in that now under consideration, *Philip.* ii. 25. For tho' that appellation, Ἀπόστολος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, *an Apostle of Jesus Christ*, always denotes a person in office; yet the other, ἀπόστολος ὑμῶν, *your Apostle*, or ἀπόστολος ἐκκλησιῶν, *the Churches Apostle*, does not. Now that *Epaphroditus* was truly an Apostle, in our sense of the word, that is, *a Messenger* of the Church of *Philippi*, we learn from St. *Paul* himself: chap. iv. 18. *I am full, having receiv'd of* Epaphroditus *the things which were sent from you.* Nay, he hints the same in the place before us: *Yet I suppos'd it necessary to send to you* Epaphroditus, *my brother and companion in labour, and fellow soldier; but your* ἀπόστολον, *Messenger, and he that ministred to my wants.* These last words, *and he that ministred to my wants*, not only prove *Epaphroditus* was an *Apostle*, in the sense we give of the word, *viz.* that he was a Messenger; but they seem to be added, as an explication of that term used by the Apostle. Setting aside therefore all zeal for a party, our Adversaries can prove nothing by that text, till they can by some other arguments make it appear, he was an *Apostle*, in their sense of the word.

Dr. *Whitby* ingenuously owns, St. *Paul*'s Words dont prove he was their Bishop; but yet believes it, upon the testimony of *Theodorit*, *Chrysostom*, and *Theophylact*.† But we can't build much upon their authority in such a matter, since we are uncertain whether they receiv'd their opinion from any antient writers, or only gather'd it from some places of the New Testament, which they misunderstood. Further, neither *Theophylact*, nor *Chrysostom*, give that interpretation as a certain truth, but only as a conjecture; and call him not their Bishop, but their Doctor or Teacher. So *Theophylact* explains

* *pag.* 238. † *See him upon* Philip. i. 1: *and his Pref. to that* Epistle.

explains the passage: "That is, I give you back again him "who was sent to me from you; for they had sent to the "Apostle by him such things as he wanted. Or else he "says your Apostle, that is, your Master or Teacher." In like manner *Chrysostom*: "We give you back what's your "own; or, we send you him who is one of you, or your "Teacher."

But let us a little consider Dr. *Whithy*'s Note upon the place. "But the word *Apostle* is never used in the New "Testament, but either of those who were in the strict "sense *Apostles* of the Lord, or else were eminent Ministers "and Preachers of the Gospel. Thus *Titus*, and the Bro- "ther of St. *Paul* (which is the usual appellation of St. *Ti-* "*mothy*; see Note on *Hebr.* xiii. 23.) are ἀπόστολοι, *the Apostles* "of the Churches, 2 *Cor.* viii. 22, 23." * The learned Doctor hardly minded here what he wrote: for he has no Note upon that place to the *Hebr.* and only refers in his Paraphrase to his Preface, where indeed he maintains the same opinion. But besides that; altho' here he follows those who under- stand St. *Paul*'s Brother, mention'd 2 *Cor.* viii. 23. to be *Timothy*; yet upon the place it self he defends the opinion of the antients, who thought he intended St. *Luke*. But whoever will look into the place, will see, that he speaks of one, if not more, besides *Titus*, and *Timothy*, or *Luke*, whom he calls the *Apostles*, or Messengers of the Churches. And since Dr. *Whitby* can't tell who they are, he is too hasty in asserting, the word is never used of any other, but *eminent Ministers and Preachers* of the Gospel. But Dr. *Whitby* adds:

"And *Andronicus* and *Junia*, who had long preached the "Gospel, are stiled, ἐπίσημοι ἐν τοῖς ἀποστόλοις, *eminent among* "*the Apostles of Christ*." But how does that appear? Who is it, that testifies they had *long preach'd the Gospel*? This at least is very uncertain concerning *Junia*, it being doubtful whe- ther 'tis the name of a man or a woman. *Chrysostom*, *Theo- phylact*, *Oecumenius*, *Origen*, *Hilary* the Deacon, *Pelagius*, *Pri- masius*, *Beda*, *Haimo*, and *Remigius*, read not *Junia*, but *Julia*, believing her to be a woman; as the learned *Blondel* assures us. † They deal very unfairly in citing the Fathers, who, upon the testimonies of a few of them, make *Epaphroditus* Bishop of *Philippi*; and yet affirm *Junia* was a man, and a Preacher of the Gospel, upon the single testimony of *Doro-*

* *Upon* Philip. ii. 25. † Apol. p. 107.

theus, a moſt impertinent writer; when they have ſo many and conſiderable writers againſt that opinion. *Dorotheus*, I confeſs, ſays, *Junia* was Biſhop of *Apamia* in *Syria*; but if his impertinent accounts deſerve any regard, *Epaphroditus* muſt not have been Biſhop of *Philippi*, but of *Adriana* or *Ariadna*. But let us ſuppoſe *Andronicus* and *Junia* were both of them Preachers; yet they were not Biſhops, according to the pretended ſignification of the word *Apoſtles*. For if we imagine St. *Paul* ſpoke of them as Biſhops, *Rom.* xvi. 7. there muſt have been three Biſhops of *Rome* at the ſame time; for to theſe two we muſt add a third, out of the catalogues of the antients. And every body knows how contrary that is to our Adverſaries ſcheme.

Further, *Theodorit*, to whom Dr. *Whithy* and Dr. *Nichols* both appeal, pretends to no other authority, but that of this one text, for his making *Epaphroditus* Biſhop of *Philippi*; as appears from his own Words. "He calls him, *ſays he*, "their Apoſtle, who was intruſted with the care of them: "ſo that 'tis plain, they, who in the beginning were call'd "Biſhops, officiated under him, in the order of Presbyters." And to the ſame purpoſe are *Theodorit*'s words, refer'd to by Dr. *Nichols*; tho' he has not rightly noted the place: for he does not uſe theſe words upon *Philip.* ii. 25. but upon *Philip.* i. 1.

I will next conſider the teſtimony of *Jerom*, who really no where ſays, *Epaphroditus* was Biſhop of *Philippi*; nay, he ſeems to have thought, that meer Presbyters, or Prieſts, were ſometimes call'd Apoſtles. But that we may be the more certain of his opinion, I will ſet down what he ſays more at length. "But others are call'd Apoſtles beſide the "twelve; the reaſon is, becauſe all that had ſeen the "Lord, and preach'd him afterwards, were nam'd Apoſtles, "as 'tis ſaid to the *Corinthians*: *Who was ſeen of the eleven*; "*after that, he was ſeen of five hundred brethren at once, of* "*whom the greater part remain unto this day, but ſome are fallen* "*aſleep*; *then he was ſeen of* James, *and then of all the Apoſtles.*"* Then follow the words quoted by the Doctor. "But after- "wards by degrees others, beſide thoſe choſen by our Lord, "were ordain'd Apoſtles, as the *Epiſtle* to the *Philippians* de- "clares in theſe words: *But I thought it needful to ſend unto* "*you* Epaphroditus, *your Apoſtle.*" What hinders now, but that,

* Upon Gal. i. 19.

that, in *Jerom*'s opinion, all the Preachers of the Goſpel might be call'd Apoſtles? If we compare herewith, what he ſays in his Comment upon the firſt verſe of the chapter, we ſhall not be able any longer to doubt of his opinion. "That he might make a diſtinction, *ſays he*, between "thoſe who were ſent by men, and himſelf, who was ſent "by Chriſt, he begins his Epiſtle in that manner: *Paul*, "*an Apoſtle, not of man, neither by man.* An *Apoſtle*, that is, "*one ſent*, is properly an *Hebrew* way of ſpeaking, as *Silas*, "which ſignifies *ſent*, has thence his Name.——But there "are four ſorts of Apoſtles: the firſt, neither of man, nor "by man, but by *Jeſus Chriſt*, and God the Father; the "ſecond, *of God, and yet by man*; the third is of man, not "of God; the fourth is neither of God, nor by man, nor "of man, but of himſelf. Of the firſt ſort may be reckon'd "*Iſaiah*, and the other Prophets, and the Apoſtle *Paul* him-"ſelf, who was not ſent of men, or by man; but by God "the Father, and Chriſt. Of the ſecond ſort may be *Joſhua* "the ſon of *Nun*, who was of God indeed made an Apoſtle, "but by the man *Moſes*. The third ſort is, when any one "is ordain'd by the favour and intereſt of men, as we ſee "ſome men put into the Prieſthood, not by the approba-"tion of God, but by the favour which they have pur-"chas'd among the common people. The fourth ſort con-"ſiſts of falſe Prophets, and falſe Apoſtles." Who does not ſee that, according to *Jerom*, all Prieſts, who were ordain'd agreeably to the will of God, might be reckon'd of the ſecond ſort, and might be term'd Apoſtles? *Jerom* therefore thought *Epaphroditus* was ordain'd to ſome ſacred office; which ſeems probable enough, from the Apoſtle's words: but that he is call'd Biſhop of the *Philippians* by *Jerom*, is very falſe; nor does it appear that *Jerom* had the leaſt thought of that matter. The argument from the title of an Apoſtle ſignifies nothing; for the ſame is given by *Tertullian* to *Philip*, * as a Perſon ſent of God, altho' he could not be reckon'd an Apoſtle in our Author's ſenſe, ſeeing he was but a Deacon.

A third of this order was Titus, *call'd the Apoſtle of Churches* [of the meaning of which expreſſion enough is ſaid already] *and ordain'd Biſhop of* Crete. This hardly agrees with the ſentiments of the Epiſcoparians. They frequently pretend,

* De Baptiſmo, c. 18.

that every city or church ſhould have its own Biſhop. So Dr. *Hammond*: "Now for the κατ' ἐκκλησίαν, 'tis beſt ren-
" der'd *Church by Church*, i. e. in every Church one Elder or
" Biſhop. And ſo χειροτονεῖν πρεσβυτέρους κατ' ἐκκλησίαν, *to*
" *ordain Elders in every Church*, is all one with καταστῆσαι
" πρεσβυτέρους κατὰ πόλιν, *to conſtitute Elders in every city*, Tit.
" i. 5. every city having a Biſhop in it, and ſo call'd a
" Church, to which the believers in all parts about it be-
" long'd, and that Biſhop having power to make as many
" inferior officers, as he thought good." * He therefore took *Titus* to be, not a plain Biſhop, but an Archbiſhop; and the Presbyters to be ordain'd by him are, in Dr. *H*'s judgment, Biſhops properly ſo call'd. And 'tis the common maxim of the Epiſcopal party, that a Biſhop and a Church are in a relation to one another, and that there can be but one Biſhop in any one Church. But Dr. *Nichols*, tho' he calls not *Titus* Archbiſhop, yet makes him the Biſhop of many Churches, and therefore ſtiles him *the Apoſtle of the Churches*, and preſently adds in the *Latin* edition, that he had *a power granted him of governing the Churches*; and by the Presbyters therefore, whom *Titus* was to ordain, he underſtood thoſe of the inferior ſort. Now I would gladly have our Adverſaries prove, if they can, that one Biſhop was ever over ſeveral Churches at the ſame time; or that any one Church, beſide the Catholic, was made up of ſeveral Churches. Our Author's manner of expreſſion is quite different from that of the New Teſtament. There is not one place in the New Teſtament, where the Chriſtians of two or more cities are call'd a Church in the ſingular number, as tho' they made but one Church. The Chriſtians of the ſame city are always call'd *a Church*, but thoſe of the country are conſtantly term'd *Churches*. So we read of, not the Church, but the *Churches* of *Judea*, *Gal.* i. 22. 1 *Theſſ.* ii. 14. *Macedonia*, 2 *Cor.* viii. 1. *Aſia*, 1 *Cor.* xvi. 19. *Galatia*, 1 *Cor.* xvi. 1. *Gal.* i. 2. Upon this place *Jerom*'s Comment is very good: "'Tis to be obſerv'd, that
" he ſays, *to the Churches of Galatia*; becauſe in this Epiſ-
" tle he did not write to the ſingle Church of one city,
" but in general to all the Churches of the whole province;
" and he calls them *Churches*, which he afterward reproves
" for their being corrupted with errors."

In

* *Upon* Acts xiv. 23.

In the dispute I had some time since with Dr. *Wells*, I deny'd there was mention made in the New Testament of any Church but the Church Catholic, or the Church of one particular place or city. That Gentleman was pleas'd to alledge two instances to the contrary. One was the Church of *Corinth*, which, he pleasantly fancied, comprehended in it all the Christian assemblies that were in *Achaia*. This he would gather from the words of the Apostle: *To the Church of God, which is at* Corinth, *with all the Saints that are in all* Achaia.* And so he endeavour'd to confound, what the Apostle most expresly distinguishes. But no body will easily believe, the Christians of the whole region of *Achaia* were contain'd in the one Church of *Corinth*, when he considers, that Church did not so much as comprehend the Christian assembly of *Cenchrea*. The same Apostle shews, that at *Cenchrea*, which was a port belonging to *Corinth*; and very near it, there was settled a Church distinct from that of *Corinth*.† The other instance produc'd by my Adversary was that of *Crete*; but no such Church is mention'd in Scripture. And they who make *Titus* Bishop of *Crete*, must hold that all the *Cretians* made but one Church. Whereas Dr. *Nichols* would have *Titus* a Bishop, and yet thinks the *Cretians* under his care were form'd into several Churches. But now if the Episcopal authority in that Island was, according to this notion, committed to none but *Titus*; what were the *Cretians* to do upon his death? Who then would have the power of chusing, and ordaining a new Bishop? I can hardly think, the Apostle so manag'd the affairs of the Churches, as that they had not severally a power within themselves of continuing that order, which he settled among them. And was there no other reason, I could not easily fall in with the Episcopal scheme; according to which no Church is, or can be, so constituted, as to be able to subsist without the help of strangers; but utterly loses the power of ordination, as often as their Bishop dies.

Chrysostom, *Oecumenius*, *Theophylact*, and *Theodorit*, all testify, as I shall shew, that the Apostle would not commit so large an Island to one man. And truly, whoever reads the Epistle to *Titus*, without any party biass, presently sees, he was not fix'd there by St. *Paul*, as the ordinary Bishop of the *Cretians*; but was only left there for some services ne-

* 2 Cor. i. 1. † Rom. xvi. 1.

ceſſary to be perform'd at that particular time. The Apoſtles travelling through various countries, preached the Goſpel wherever they came; and then thoſe whom they converted, they form'd into Churches: and of theſe firſt fruits they ordain'd ſome to be Biſhops, and ſome to be Deacons; chuſing and diſcerning them by the Spirit, as *Clement* of *Rome* tells us. And yet, ſince ſuch young beginners were not, immediately upon their converſion, ſo fit to diſcharge the ſacred function; they were to be train'd up to it by teaching, exerciſe and ſtudy, for which time was requiſite. Whence the Apoſtle, while the extraordinary gifts of the Spirit abounded in the Church, forbids the ordination of a *Novice*.* Now when the Apoſtle was making haſte to viſit other regions, he could not, for want of time, ordain Biſhops for all the *Cretians*, and ſet ſome other things in order, that were wanting among them. Hence he gives commandment to *Titus*, his companion in travelling, to ſtay and take care of thoſe things: *For this cauſe left I thee in* Crete, *that thou ſhouldeſt ſet in order the things that are wanting, and ordain Elders in every city, as I had appointed thee.* † He did not therefore ſettle him as Biſhop of *Crete*, but left him there according to the preſent exigence of affairs, that, when he had diſpatch'd thoſe affairs, he might make haſte to be with him again; as is plain by what he ſays, chap. iii. 12. *When I ſhall ſend* Artemas *to thee, or* Tychicus, *be diligent to come to me to* Nicopolis: *for I have determin'd there to winter.* And if *Titus* muſt therefore be call'd the Biſhop of *Crete*, becauſe he was left there by the Apoſtle; why may he not by the ſame reaſon be reckon'd the Biſhop of *Dalmatia*, ſince he ſeems to have been ſent thither by him? ‖ But let us hear what our Author has further to ſay of *Titus*.

His Charge, we find, was not that of a meer Presbyter, to preach the word and adminiſter the ſacraments; but more than that, to ſet in order the things that were wanting, and ordain Elders in every city in *Crete*; *which none below the dignity of a Biſhop might do, without the greateſt wound and ſcandal to religion.*

We need not be told, this is the opinion of the abetters of the Hierarchy. But that is here taken for granted, which is the main thing that needs to be prov'd. He is of opinion, there were ſome Presbyters, who had not the power of

* 1 Tim. iii. 6. † Tit. i. 5. ‖ 2 Tim. iv. 19.

of ordaining granted to them; which is the chief, if not the only point here in debate. But he is mistaken, who expects to find us easy enough to assent to this kind of fallacious conclusions. In a word, I deny there are any such Presbyters mention'd in the Holy Scriptures. As for those ordain'd by *Titus*, I will presently shew, they had the power of ordination. In the mean time, I think it worth remarking; that as Christ at first appointed not a Monarchical, but an Aristocratical form of government in his Church (which appears from what I have said already, and from *Matth.* xviii. 18, 19, 20.) so the Apostles were very careful, after his ascension, to retain the same: who therefore (as we learn from the *Acts*) travell'd up and down the world, and order'd ecclesiastical affairs, not alone, but being accompany'd by some Presbyters. Whence there is no reason to believe, that *Titus* alone was to ordain Elders among the *Cretians*. *Titus*, I confess, was to have the chief hand in all administrations; but if all things had been committed to his management alone, for what purpose were *Zenas* and *Apollos* left with him in *Crete* by the Apostle? I desire our Judges also here to take notice, that they are all charg'd, as authors of the *greatest wound and scandal to religion*; namely, that being *meer Presbyters*, and *below the dignity of a Bishop*, they invade his peculiar office. And who can grudge to be condemn'd by Judges, who will confess themselves guilty of so enormous a crime?

For these reasons Eusebius *calls* Titus *a Bishop*. And who doubts he was a Bishop? They, who think there is no difference between a Presbyter and a Bishop, will never call this in question. But supposing this had been render'd according to the Doctor's mind, that Eusebius *says*, *he had the Bishoprick of* Crete: I say, this can't be true, according to the Episcopal scheme, since a Bishop can be the Bishop only of one Church. Further, *Eusebius* does not deliver this as a certain thing, but only as a report. And how many false things were then reported? such as the stories he relates concerning *James* the *Just*, out of *Hegesippus*; and concerning *Simon Magus*, out of *Justin*, &c. And since *Eusebius* mentions not his vouchers, and relates perhaps nothing but what he had by report, we need not much regard his authority; especially since the very learned Bishop of *Oxford*, a rigid assertor of the Hierarchy, has told us: "That the "first ages of the Church took such a liberty in counter-"feiting, and were so very easy in believing, that the cre-

"dit

" dit of their hiſtory is very much weaken'd thereby ; and " not only the world, but the Church of God, has juſt " reaſon to complain of her fabulous times. " *

In like manner Timothy *was ordain'd Biſhop of* Epheſus. Next to the firſt Church of *Jeruſalem*, conſtituted immediately by Chriſt himſelf, which ſhould be an Example to all Churches ; there is none, to which we ſhould rather deſire the modern Churches ſhould be conform'd, than that of *Epheſus*. St. *Paul* commits it to the government of the Presbyters (whom he alſo calls Biſhops) and that when *Timothy* was preſent, as ſome learned men with great probability conjecture. Whence 'tis plain, *Timothy* could not be, as the Epiſcoparians pretend, the firſt Biſhop of *Epheſus*. Nor are there wanting other good evidences of the truth of our opinion. The Biſhop of a Church was not to wander about, but to be fix'd in his own Church. But *Timothy* ſtaid not long at *Epheſus* ; but being ſent by the Apoſtle, travell'd thro' various regions : and by the ſame right he is reckon'd the Biſhop of *Epheſus*, he ought to be reckon'd the Biſhop of *Macedonia*, *Berea*, *Corinth*, or *Theſſalonica*. † And if *Timothy* was indeed the Biſhop of *Epheſus*, why ſhould the Apoſtle beſeech him to continue at *Epheſus*? If he had been backward to it, there was more reaſon for his commanding, than beſeeching him.

The arguments which the Doctor brings from the firſt *Epiſtle to Timothy*, dont prove him to have been the Biſhop of that Church. For the things, which the Apoſtle commanded *Timothy* to do, were not to be done by himſelf alone ; the Biſhops ſettled before in that Church were to join with him therein. Nor can it be any wonder, that the Apoſtle gives a charge particularly to *Timothy* about them. The chief care would belong to him, as a perſon who by uſe and experience had gain'd more ſkill, and was fit to lead the reſt. But whatever authority was given to *Timothy*, had, before his coming, been granted to the Biſhops ſettled at *Epheſus*, and belongs without diſtinction to all Presbyters ; as appears by many clear teſtimonies of the Holy Scripture. Nor are other Examples of this way of ſpeaking wanting in the New Teſtament. So thoſe things, which belong'd in common to the whole Apoſtolical order, ‖ are

* Monitio ad Lect. ad fin. oper. Cypr. *p.* 53. † See 2 Tim. iv. 21. Heb. xiii. 23 Acts x x 22. and xvii. 15. 1 Cor. iv. 17. 1 Theſ. iii. 2. ‖ Mat. xvi. 19. John xxi. 15, 16.

are by our Saviour himſelf given in charge, and promis'd to *Peter* particularly, as the *firſt* or *chief* of them, as he is call'd, *Matth.* x. 2. And thus many of the antients explain our Lord's words to him. Thus *Theophylact*: "Al-"tho' it be ſaid only to *Peter*, *I will give thee*; yet the "ſame was given to all the Apoſtles." * In like manner *Ambroſe*: "*I will give thee*, ſays he, *the keys of the kingdom* "*of heaven.*——What is ſaid to *Peter*, is ſaid to the Apoſtles "in general." † *Auguſtine* goes the ſame way: "As "among the Apoſtles, when there were twelve of them, "and the queſtion was put to all, *Peter* alone returns the "anſwer, *Thou art the Chriſt, the Son of the living God.* And "'tis ſaid to him, *I will give thee the keys of the kingdom of* "*heaven*; as tho' he alone receiv'd the power of binding "and looſing; whereas he made that anſwer in the name "of all the Apoſtles, and receiv'd this promiſe together "with them all, as repreſenting the whole united body of "them. [*Tanquam perſonam gerens unitatis.*]" ‖ But *Photius* is yet clearer, who, rejecting the interpretation of *Eulogius*, gives this as the ſenſe of Chriſt's words: "Altho 'this be "ſpoken to *Peter*, yet in the perſon of their chief, the "ſame power is given to the reſt of the Apoſtles." ‡ Thus *Chryſoſtom* explains the words of Chriſt, *Joan.* xxi. 15, 16. "Why paſſing over all the reſt, do's he ſpeak of theſe "matters only to *Peter*? Becauſe he was the chief Apoſtle, "the mouth of the Diſciples, and the top of the com-"pany." *

Now if our Adverſaries arguments, from what is ſaid ſo particularly to *Timothy*, will prove him to have had a Monarchical power in the Church of *Epheſus*; why may not the Papiſts, by the ſame kind of argument, from our Saviour's words to *Peter*, aſſert that he had ſuch a Monarchical power in the Catholic Church? Why may not they talk of *Peter*, juſt as our Author does of *Timothy*? *But to what purpoſe did St.* Paul *give him theſe inſtructions about governing the Church, if he were not ſuperior to others?* † The Papiſts may uſe exactly the ſame Argument: *To what purpoſe did our Saviour give* Peter *theſe Inſtructions about governing the Church, if he were not ſuperior to the reſt of the Apoſtles?* But he goes on:

If

* *Upon* Matth. xvi. 19. † Enarr. in Pſalm. xxxviii. ſub. fin. ‖ In Joann. Tract 118. ‡ Biblioth. cod. 280. *p.* 1600. * In Joann. Homil. 87. † *pag.* 239.

If his rank and power were not above that of common Presbyters, how could he be authoriz'd, not only to take cognizance of their misdemeanors, but likewise to correct those whom he found culpable? I have answer'd already, this power was not given to *Timothy* alone. The power of governing a Church belongs to its whole Presbytery; nor is there any Bishop or Presbyter in the Church, with respect to whom the Presbytery is not *authoriz'd to take cognizance of* his *misdemeanors, and correct* him, *when found culpable.* And *Timothy* was no more among the Bishops of *Ephesus*, than *Peter* among the Apostles; who, tho' he was their chief, might yet fall under the censure of his fellow Apostles. And truly, if any thing particular be suppos'd granted to *Timothy* and *Titus*, above other Presbyters; that must belong to them, not as Bishops, but as Evangelists, or such extraordinary Ministers as were to have none to succeed them in their office. But that I may dispatch this affair: 'Tis most certain the Presbyters, who were ordain'd, either in the Church of *Ephesus* by *Timothy*, or in the Churches of *Crete* by *Titus*, had themselves the power of ordination; and consequently neither *Timothy* nor *Titus* were Bishops, in the sense our Adversaries put upon that word. The Episcoparians and Presbyterians agree, that the powers of government and ordination go together: if therefore those Presbyters had the former, they must of necessity have had the latter also. But that they had the power of government appears from the Apostle; who requires that a person to be ordain'd a Bishop, should be *blameless*, &c. *one that rules his own house, having his children in subjection with all gravity:* * and gives this reason for it; *for if a man know not how to rule his own house, how shall he take care of the Church of God?* † The care then of the Church of God is committed to them, and they are ordain'd the rulers thereof; as Dr. *Hammond* well expresses the meaning of that reason given by the Apostle, in his Paraphrase upon it. "For sure he that "cannot rule so much a less province, will be unfit to be "made a governor of the Church of God." The same is evident concerning those ordain'd by *Titus*: *A Bishop*, says the Apostle, *must be blameless as the steward of God*; that is, says the same learned Commentator, "as becomes one "that hath the government of God's family intrusted to "him."

---

* 1 Tim. iii. 2, 4. † *Ver.* 5.

" him. " He was therefore of opinion, that thoſe whom they ordain'd, were Biſhops properly ſo call'd, and had themſelves the power of ordination : and we therein readily agree with him.

Such now, moſt learned Arbitrators, are the arguments which the patrons of the Hierarchy fetch from the Holy Scriptures to eſtabliſh their own Prelacy, and diſprove your form of adminiſtration. With ſuch ſorry weapons they boaſtingly pretend (who would think it ?) that the Presbyterian government has long ago been mortally wounded. Relying upon theſe arguments, they many of them deny, not only that we, but that you alſo, in whatever Reform'd countries, have any Church, Miniſtry, Sacraments, or even Chriſtianity it ſelf ; that ſo they may the more intirely ſecure theſe things to themſelves and the Papiſts. I am griev'd, if what they pretend is true : I am indeed griev'd for your ſakes, my Brethren, that you ſhould be thus wandring, without the pale of the Church, from the way of ſalvation. Since ſo clear a light ſhines round about you ; open, I beſeech you, at length your eyes, and ſuffer not your ſelves to remain any longer in that thick darkneſs, in which you have liv'd hitherto. Quit your groſs errors, and diſdain not any longer to accept of a new and valid ordination from our *Engliſh* Prelates. Ceaſe to deceive your people with a counterfeited authority, to defile them with prophane water, and to mock them with a ſham Euchariſt. Hence you may gueſs, of what ſort thoſe *London Caſes* of the Epiſcoparians againſt us are ; than which our Author ſays, *he has ſeldom ſeen any book wrote with more politeneſs and ſolidity.* * By this one, you may judge of the reſt of their writings. Without doubt theſe arguments would long ago have appear'd ridiculous to themſelves, as well as to us, had they not had ſome others of a different kind : I mean, the ſecular advantages annexed to their notions. Nay, they themſelves ſeem to diſtruſt the Holy Scripture's defence of their principles, when they ſo eagerly fly to their great refuge of the Fathers. Mind now with how much triumph he begins his appeal to their writings.

But if the antient records of the Church be conſulted, they will give ample teſtimony to the Epiſcopal order. He

* *page* 96.

he would have confeſs'd the truth, he ſhould have ſaid: Altho' little help can be expected to our cauſe from the Holy Scriptures, and they afford us no teſtimonies of any great weight, yet we need not deſpair; for that defect will be made up abundantly by the number, if not the worth, of teſtimonies of another ſort. Suppoſe this now to be true, let all thoſe *antient records give the moſt ample teſtimony to the Epiſcopal order:* are we to reckon them a rule of faith or diſcipline? Can any thing, upon their authority, be ſaid to be neceſſary in the Church, concerning which the Sacred Writings are perpetually ſilent? Certainly, if the word of God is the only rule of eccleſiaſtical diſcipline: *If all Scripture is given by inſpiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, reproof, correction, and inſtruction in righteouſneſs*; that the man of God (that is, the Miniſter of the Goſpel) *may be perfect, throughly furniſh'd to every good work*; * there is no need we ſhould heed any other writers, where the Scripture is ſilent. Whatever is not found herein, if it ſhould be lawful, yet cannot poſſibly be neceſſary. Further, that I may ſpeak my mind freely: If we were certain by the writings of the antients, that the Apoſtles us'd ſome things, of which we have no mention in the Holy Scriptures, I hardly think we ſhould be under any neceſſity of retaining them always in our Churches. For beſides the Holy Scriptures we have no revelation of the divine Will. God has no where commanded us to make the judgment of any uninſpir'd men, however antient they were, a rule to our ſelves for the ordering our faith or diſcipline. Whatſoever is in the Church made a rule of truth and goodneſs, muſt be obvious even to the loweſt of the people, that ſo all may be ſatisfy'd they are bound by God's command. Now this is true of the Holy Scriptures, but not of the writings of any of the antients. Upon which account therefore I might diſmiſs the Doctor, with the antient writers he brags of; ſince he has brought nothing of moment from the Bible to eſtabliſh the Epiſcopal Dignity. But that there may be no cauſe of complaint, I will endeavour likewiſe to trace their opinion.

Now here 'tis eſpecially to be obſerv'd, that if the Fathers are to be eſteem'd for their antiquity; then the older, the more valuable they are, and the more authority they ſhould

* 1 Tim. iii. 16, 17.

ſhould have with us. If the Epiſcoparians will grant us this demand (and who can help ſeeing the equity of it?) there will be no great reaſon, for our being afraid of the Fathers hurting our cauſe, or for their triumphing in them as the patrons of their own. We have two of the moſt antient of them clearly on our ſide, *viz. Clement* of *Rome*, and *Polycarp*. There are no ſigns of eccleſiaſtical Monarchy in *Clement*. A Presbyterian can hardly declare our opinion more clearly and fully than in his words. Every thing he ſays of the form of eccleſiaſtical government exactly agrees with the Scripture. Hence the Epiſcopal writers differ as much about his meaning, as they do about the New Teſtament: there are almoſt as many interpretations of his words, as there are writers among them, who mention his opinion; as might eaſily be ſhewn, if there were occaſion. He never diſtinguiſhes Presbyters from Biſhops; but theſe names ſignify the ſame with him, as they do alſo with the Sacred Writers. He makes the Church of *Corinth* to be ſubject not to one ſingle perſon, but to a company of Biſhops or Presbyters. He reproves the *Corinthians* for their making an oppoſition againſt their Presbyters. Finally, that I may omit other matters, he acknowledges only a twofold order of Miniſtry. Thus he tells us: "The Apoſtles preaching up and down in countries and "cities, ordain'd the firſt fruits or converts of thoſe pla-"ces, diſcerning them by the Spirit, to be Biſhops and "Deacons of thoſe who ſhould afterwards believe." *

To *Clement* we may add *Polycarp*, who alſo mentions only two orders in his Epiſtle. "Wherefore, *ſays he*, you muſt "abſtain from all theſe things, and be ſubject to the Preſ-"byters and Deacons, as to God and Chriſt." †

If then any credit is to be given to theſe two moſt antient witneſſes, an Ariſtocratial form of government obtain'd from the firſt beginning of the Chriſtian Church. Many other antient writers confirm the ſame opinion.

I do not indeed deny, that in every Church there was one chief Presbyter, who was their conſtant Moderator. I am ſo far from blaming this cuſtom, that I think it was deriv'd from the Holy Scriptures, as I have endeavour'd to prove in a little Treatiſe I once had ſome thoughts of printing. However I aſſert, that firſt or chief Presbyter was not

* *Epiſt.* i. *c.* 42. † *Sect.* 5.

not of a different order from the reſt; nor was he the ſole ruler or Monarch of the Church. The writers of the ſecond Century began, I confeſs, to diſtinguiſh the names of Biſhop and Presbyter; although that is not done univerſally and conſtantly by them. This is not deny'd by Biſhop *Burnet*, who ſays: "And I the more "willingly incline to believe Biſhops and Presbyters, to "be the ſeveral degrees of the ſame office, ſince the "names of Biſhop and Presbyter are uſed for the ſame "thing in Scripture; and are alſo uſed promiſcuouſly by "the writers of the two firſt Centuries." * Nor do any writers of that time confirm their opinion, who hold the offices of Presbyters and Biſhops, were diſtinct kinds or orders of Miniſtry. None of them ſay a Presbyter, when choſen in the room of a deceas'd Biſhop, had a new impoſition of hands to ordain, or, as we now uſually ſpeak, to conſecrate him. The writers, indeed, of the third and following ages teſtify, this was the practice of their time; namely when it was the cuſtom for men to be ſolemnly initiated into ſuch offices, as God had no where appointed. Thus in *Cyprian*'s time, hands were laid upon *Leſtors*, (that is, thoſe who read the Scriptures in the Congregation, and were inferior to Deacons) if not upon *Acolyths* and *Subdeacons*. † But let us return to our Author.

For Ignatius, *St.* Peter's *Scholar, and converſant with the Apoſtles, mentions three orders in the Church, Biſhops, Prieſts and Deacons.* ‖

I acknowledge, *Ignatius*, in the places refer'd to, mentions Biſhops, Presbyters and Deacons: but he never affirms, that the power of ruling the Church, and ordaining Miniſters is only granted to the Biſhops. But on the contrary, he always admoniſhes the people to ſubmit to the Biſhop and Presbyters. Nor is it any wonder, if the power of the chief Presbyter, whom I allow to have been conſtant Moderator, did by degrees increaſe, and was inlarg'd beyond its due bounds. Nay, the more holy, and the more diligent in managing the Churches affairs they appear'd to be; the more readily would the reſt of the Presbyters, and the body of the people leave the chief care of the Church in their hands. And as the name Biſhop imports *labour, rather*

* Vindicat. of the Church of *Scotl. page* 311. † *See* Cypr. Epiſt. 38, 39. Oxf. *Edit.* ‖ Epiſt. ad Trall. *ſect.* 2. ad Phil. *ſect.* 8.

ther than honour, * as *Auguſtine* ſays, and the chief Presbyter then apply'd himſelf principally thereto; ſo that name contrary to Scripture uſe, began to be appropriated to him. As to *Ignatius*, therefore, altho' in the paſſage alledg'd he diſtinguiſhes between a Presbyter and a Biſhop; yet no one, I think, will ever be able to prove, he thought them to be of different orders, or that a Biſhop was more than what I have allow'd. If any thing is found in other places of his Epiſtles, which may ſeem to favour the opinion of our Adverſaries; it is partly to be aſcrib'd to an affected way of writing common to the *Aſiatics*; and partly to the compariſons he uſes, and many times with very little judgment. But let us hear what further evidence he brings from *Ignatius*.

And commands, that tho' the Biſhop be a younger man than the Presbyters, they ſhould however ſhew him all honour and reſpect. For the proof of this, he brings a paſſage out of his Letter to the *Magneſians*; which, tho' it be not ſet down at large, or tranſlated in the *Engliſh*, as in the *Latin* edition, I ſhall yet preſent the reader with, making ſome remarks upon it. 'Tis thus in the *Greek*: Καὶ ὑμῖν δὲ πρέπει μὴ συγχρῆσθαι τῇ ἡλικίᾳ τοῦ ἐπισκόπου, ἀλλὰ κατὰ δύναμιν Θεῷ πατέρα πᾶσαν ἐπιτρέπειν αὐτῷ ἀπονέμειν, καθὼς ἔγνων καὶ τοὺς ἁγίους πρεσβυτέρους, οὐ προσειληφότας τὸ φαινόμενον νεωτερικὴν τάξιν, ἀλλ' ὡς φρονίμους ἐν Θεῷ συγκαταθεμένους αὐτῷ. This paſſage is exceeding obſcure. The word συγχρῆσθαι is render'd by Dr. *N. Familiarius ac ſuperbe uti*; and the ſenſe ſeems to require the rendring it to that purpoſe; tho' the common uſe of the word would hardly lead to it. It ſignifies *couti*, as the old *Latin* interpretation renders it, that is, *to have dealings with one*, or, *to borrow*; neither of which can be here admitted. Thus the word is well render'd by the vulgar *Latin*, *Non enim coutuntur Judæi Samaritanis*; that is, *For the* Jews *have no dealings with the* Samaritans. † *Voſſius* took notice of this, in his Notes upon the place: "Συγχρῆσθαι, *ſays he*, in the *Acts of the Apoſtles*, (he "meant in *John*) ſignifies *couti*, *to have dealings with one*. "So 'tis render'd in the old Gloſſaries, and the old ver- "ſion of *Ignatius*; *ſed vos decet non couti ætate Epiſcopi*. This "tranſlation is obſcure, if the word be ſo render'd, which "yet neither can, nor ought to be otherwiſe render'd. "But *Ignatius* ſays, they ſhould not *couti*, that is, *bor-*

* De Civit Dei. *lib.* xix. *chap.* 19. † John iv. 9.

" row, and draw unto themſelves the Epiſcopacy, of a " young Biſhop." But he ſhould have taken notice, that *Ignatius* ſays not, μὴ συγχεῖσθαι τῇ ἐπισκοπῇ ; but, μὴ συγχεῖσθαι τῇ ἡλικίᾳ. But further, *Ignatius* is not there ſpeaking to the Presbyters, as our Author, and perhaps *Voſſius* imagin'd ; but to the people : and that he might the more excite them to their duty, he propoſes to them a good example. Now, there was no reaſon to fear the people ſhould be able to get his Epiſcopacy, that is, his power into their hands. This interpretation therefore, I think, muſt be rejected, and the other of our Author be embrac'd ; that *Ignatius* does not mean, they ſhould not invade his power, but that they ſhould not deſpiſe his youth ; in oppoſition to which he urges them to reverence him. But then the expreſſion is harſh and unuſual. Again, thoſe words of *Ignatius*, ὃ προσεπηνότας τὴν φανομένην νεωτερικὴν τάξιν, ſeem very ill render'd by our Author. For what ? Does not νεωτερικὴ τάξις ſignify rather, *a novel conſtitution*, as *Blondel*, and other learned men render it, than *a juvenile ordination*, as our Author turns it ? And indeed τάξις never ſignifies *ordination*, I mean in the eccleſiaſtical ſenſe, when 'tis taken for impoſition of hands. 'Tis commonly enough us'd for ordination, when thereby is meant only a conſtitution. Here therefore the old *Latin* verſion is to be prefer'd, which renders it *ordinem*. Now *ordo* here I take to be put for the office itſelf : and ſo the word is perpetually us'd in the New Teſtament, as the *order of* Aaron, *of* Melchizedec, &c. Laſtly, προσεπηνότας is here render'd *reſpicientes*, *regarding* ; without any authority. I therefore thus render the paſſage upon the whole : *And it becomes you not to make bold with the age of your Biſhop ; but to pay him all reſpect and reverence, according to the power of God the Father : as I have known holy men do, who were more aged ; not aſſuming to themſelves that degree which has lately appear'd in the Church, but with a godly prudence giving place to the Biſhop.* Since *Ignatius* ſpeaks to the Church in general, and is urging the people to reverence the Biſhop, notwithſtanding his youth ; I am apt to think, the making πρεσβύτερος in this place reſpect perſons years, rather than any office, is not diſagreeable. However, I ſhall not contend, if any one inſiſts upon its ſignifying Presbyters. The queſtion now is : What this new conſtitution was ? To which I anſwer with *Hilary* the Deacon : That whereas before this precedence was granted according to perſons age, or (as *Eutychius* and *Jerom* ſay of *Alexandria*)

andria) according to their ſtanding; now it was confer'd according to their endowments and abilities; and ſo the younger were ſometimes prefer'd to the elder. And *Ignatius* would therefore have thoſe, who being older had not receiv'd this novel order or degree, pay a regard and reverence to ſuch as were younger and prefer'd before them. And what is all this to our Author's purpoſe, whether it be render'd his, or my way? Is it ſtrange, the chiefeſt reſpect ſhould be paid to him, who was in the chiefeſt place? This will not ſeem a new thing to the Presbyterians, who always treat their Moderators in that manner; and that, however young they happen to be.

I could not but take particular notice of this paſſage, upon my comparing the larger and ſhorter Epiſtles, that are attributed to *Ignatius*, together. Mr. *Whiſton* has advanc'd a notion, that the larger are the genuine ones; and attributes the ſhorter to *Athanaſius*, or ſome of his party about his time. Now I muſt confeſs, the ſhorter Epiſtles ſeem to me the more antient, upon the moſt impartial inquiry I could make. I only mention this as a ſpecimen of thoſe evidences, which convince me. For if that interpretation I have given of this paſſage be allow'd (and indeed no other can be well born) who can doubt, whether it belongs to the antient times of the Church? Had *Athanaſius*, or any of the later Fathers of the fourth or fifth Century, writ theſe ſhorter Epiſtles, as an abridgment of the larger, as is pretended; what could enter into their heads, to occaſion them to ſpeak of this as a new order? The notions of thoſe times are quite contrary hereto. But now, if we ſuppoſe the paſſage to ſtand thus in the moſt antient edition; 'twill not be at all ſtrange, that a later hand ſhould alter it to what it now is in the larger Epiſtles. Do but conſider, how at this day, men, who find this paſſage diſagreeable to their own ſentiments, put a gloſs upon it, and make it ſpeak of a *juvenile ordination*. Juſt ſo when the writer of the larger Epiſtles found this paſſage inconſiſtent with his own apprehenſions, and the ordinary practice of the age he liv'd in; he alter'd it, and put it into plain *Greek*, expreſſing what it was natural enough for one of later times to ſay. For thus the paſſage runs, in what I count the interpolated Epiſtles: Καὶ ὑμῖν δὲ πρέπει, μὴ καταχρήσασθαι τῆς ἡλικίας τοῦ ἐπισκόπου· ἀλλὰ κατὰ γνώμην Θεοῦ πατρὸς πᾶσαν ἐντροπὴν αὐτῷ ἀπονέμειν, καθὼς ἔγνων καὶ τοὺς ἁγίους πρεσβυτέρους, οὐ πρὸς τὴν φαινομένην ἀσυνεσίαν νεότητα, ἀλλὰ πρὸς τὴν ἐν Θεῷ φρόνησιν. That is: *You ought not to*

despise the youth of the Bishop; but, according to the mind of God the Father, yield him all reverence: as I have also known the holy Presbyters do, not regarding his apparent youth, but his godly wisdom.

Let any one, who is skill'd in criticism, judge, which is more probable; that a dark place should be alter'd to a clear one, or a clear easy passage be made dark and obscure? Which is most likely, that an abridger (without making this passage a jot shorter) should put it into terms utterly disagreeable to his own time; or that an interpolator, not understanding his author, should make him speak according to the sense of his own time? Who can think any man would change καταφρονεῖν τῆς ἡλικίας, which is an easy, natural expression, into, συγχρᾶσθαι τῇ ἡλικίᾳ, which is aukward and uncommon; and especially when there is no end he can be thought to serve by it? But how evident is the reason of changing that expression to the other, to make the sense plain? Compare the terms προσειληφότας and ἀφορῶντας. Which of these suits best the later ages? The latter runs easy, in the stile of the fourth or fifth Century; but the former, according to the true sense I have given of it, can belong to none but the more antient times. I think, upon the whole, Mr. *Whiston* has demonstrated, that the shorter Epistles are much corrupted, and need great corrections; but I cannot be persuaded by his arguments, that the larger ones are not interpolated. And till we can get a more exact edition of *Ignatius*'s Letters, those we have at present seem to me of little use.

But to return from this digression: our Author alledges one place more out of *Ignatius*'s Epistle to the *Philadelphians*, which is this: *As many as belong to God and Jesus Christ, keep with the Bishop.* But he means only, while the Bishop discharges his office unblameably, and according to the mind of our Saviour. Nor do we make any doubt, whether it be our duty to adhere to such Bishops.

Justin Martyr *mentions the President, or Bishop of the Church in his time.** And in the margin thus he confirms it: ἔπειτα προσφέρεται τῷ προεστῶτι τῶν ἀδελφῶν ἄρτος---*See* Euseb. Hist. *lib.* 4. *c.* 23.

This is an instance of the acuteness of the Translator, who cites *Eusebius* for this passage of *Justin Martyr*, which is not

* *page* 240.

not there mention'd, but is found in *Justin's second Apology*. The truth is, the Doctor in his *Latin* edition had omitted to set down the place in *Justin*; but had alledg'd another testimony out of *Eusebius*, to prove the word προεστὼς was used by *Dionysius*, *Justin's cotemporary*, to signify a Bishop. I believe the Doctor was satisfy'd, by the hint I gave, he had mistook *Eusebius* for *Dionysius*, and so had blotted out that remark. But his Translator imagin'd, this reference to *Eusebius* belong'd to *Justin's* words, which it does not.

Justin's words in his famous Apology are these: "Then "is brought to the President of the Brethren, bread, and "a cup of wine and water. He then taking these, offers "glory and praise to the Father of all, through the name "of the Son, and by the Spirit; and gives thanks at large, "for our being favour'd by him with these things. When "he has concluded his prayers and thanksgivings, all the "people answer'd aloud, *Amen*; that is, *so be it*. After his "giving thanks, and the peoples answering, *Amen*; they, "who are call'd among us Deacons, give to every one of "the people present of the bread, wine and water, which "he blessed, and carry it to those who are absent." * From which place the most learned Mr. *Blondel* has argued: That *Justin* acknowledges only two degrees among the Clergy, the President and the Deacons; and three sorts of persons in the Church, the President, the Deacons, and the People. † But to speak my mind honestly; however pleas'd I am with his judgment, discover'd both in his other works, and in this his most learned Apology; yet this explication of *Justin* could never yet satisfy me. I rather think, *Justin* makes four sorts of persons in the Church; *the People*, *the Deacons*, *the Brethren*, *and the President of the Brethren*. And by the *Brethren* I understand *Presbyters*. I think the Scripture uses the word *Brethren* frequently in this sense. And since I apprehend some difficulties may be solv'd by this one observation, I will mention two places of many to this purpose. *Rom.* xvi. 23. Erastus, *the Chamberlain of the city*, *saluteth you*; *and* Quartus, *a Brother*. Who can think, *a Brother* here signifies only a Christian in general? The *Romans* would have known by the salutation itself, that he was a Christian; nor was there any need the Apostle should particularly mention it: for the Heathens did not use to send their saluta-

* *page* 161. † Blondel Apol. *p.* 22, 23.

tions to a Christian Church. 'Twill not be easy, I think, for a person to imagine any other reason for the Apostle's calling *Quartus* a Brother, rather than *Erastus*, or any of the rest who sent their salutations to the *Romans*. The other place I shall mention is, *Philip.* iv. 21, 22. where the Apostle clearly distinguishes the Brethren from the rest of the Saints, or Christians. *The Brethren, which are with me, greet you. All the Saints salute you, chiefly they that are of* Cesar's *houshold.* And that *Justin* speaks of the Brethren in this sense, may appear from his own words in that *Apology*. A little before he had said: *We bring the baptiz'd person* ἐπὶ τὰς λεγομένας ἀδελφὰς, *to those call'd Brethren.* But now if the Brethren signify'd the whole assembly, why had he not said, *we bring him to the People*? But when he says, *those* called *Brethren*, he without doubt means, persons who were in some peculiar sense so call'd; just as in the passage I have set down, speaking of the Deacons, he says, *they who with us are call'd Deacons.* Now beside the Presbyters, there are none to whom you can suppose this appellation could especially belong. And thus every thing in *Justin* is easy and plain. Nor can any one wonder, he should mention *the President of the Brethren*, when he had before, in his Apology, suggested, that some persons among them were in a peculiar sense stiled, *the Brethren.* The great reason why I understand *Justin* in this manner, is, because otherwise we must necessarily conclude, that in his time every Church was govern'd by one single Bishop or Presbyter. *Justin* is not, through his whole Apology, speaking of any one particular Church, but of all the Churches in general. And if Presbyters are not to be understood by *the Brethren*, *Justin* must make no mention at all of them; nor can you find any other Minister whatever to have been in the Church, beside the President, and the Deacons. But this is contrary to all antiquity. Ecclesiastical writers with one consent testify, there were always many Presbyters in every Church. I except here only *Epiphanius*, who has given us his conjecture, or, I may call it, his dream concerning the usage of the Apostles: "When there was not a multitude, there were "not found persons to be ordain'd Presbyters, and there "they were content with a single Bishop in a place." * We meet with nothing like this in the New Testament, and

* Haref. 75. *of the Aerians*, p. 508.

and therefore I doubt not *Epiphanius* was mistaken. However, I cannot forbear mentioning one observation of his, since he was so stiff a defender of the Episcopal Dignity. "There was need, *says he*, of Presbyters and Deacons; for "by these two ecclesiastical affairs might be manag'd. "Wherefore where no person was found worthy to be made "a Bishop, that place continu'd to be without a Bishop." But now, if ecclesiastical affairs might be manag'd by Presbyters and Deacons, Presbyters must have the power of ordination and government. But to return to *Justin*: Some may think, I now defend the *Hierarchy*, by arguing, that *Justin* acknowledges a President of the Brethren, that is, the Presbyters. But it must be observ'd, that I speak of a President only for order sake, but do not suppose him to have had any power over the Brethren. I may here well enough apply the words of *Cicero*, spoken indeed of another matter: "When many are equal in dignity, one only can have the "first place."* The word προεστὼς, which I have render'd President, I grant, signifies sometimes a person who has a ruling power; but 'tis most false to say, 'tis never used otherwise. Every one knows, there are in all languages some words of doubtful signification. So *princeps*, in *Latin* authors, sometimes signifies *a ruler*, and sometimes no more than *the first*; as *Casaubon* has observ'd in much the like controversy.† In like manner we say, the προεστὼς, or President, signifies sometimes one who has authority over the rest, and sometimes one who is not superior to the rest in dignity, but has the first place among them only for order sake. The late most learned Bp. *Stillingfleet* will supply us with a famous instance of this sense of the word, than which nothing can be more apt to our purpose. "The *Eplori* at *Sparta* enjoy'd "a parity of power among them; but among these, to give "name to the year, they made choice of one who was call'd "ἐπώνυμος, and him they call'd, προεστῶτα τῶν ἐφόρων, "as *Plutarch* tells us. Where we have the very name, προεστὼς, "attributed to him that had only this primacy of order, without any superiority of power; which is used by *Justin Mar*-"*tyr* of the President of assemblies among the Christians."‡ Lastly, tho' I make no doubt, but that in *Justin*'s time there was one certain person chosen from among the rest, who had the first place, and presided constantly among the Presbyters;

* Pro Murena. † Exercit. in Baron. tv. sect. 12. p. 333. ‡ Irenic. p. 361.

byters; yet *Justin*'s πρεσεως must not only signify him, but any other who supply'd his place in his absence, namely, τὸν τȣ̃ λόγȣ ἡγούμενον, *him that was the chief speaker*: * or else we must confess, that neither prayers could be offer'd, nor the Sacrament be administer'd, but by one person in a Church. But I have said enough of *Justin*: I now go on to our Author's other arguments.

And not only that most antient Historian Hegesippus, *but the great and learned* Dionysius, *Bishop of* Corinth, *has left Catalogues of the primitive Bishops.*

We pay little regard to the authority of *Hegesippus*; who, from his fine story of the Martyrdom of *James* the *Just*, appears to have been a man of great credulity and little judgment. The famous Bishop *Stillingfleet* has observ'd, those Catalogues are so very different, that nothing certain can be gather'd from them. But let us for the present suppose, that they who give these Catalogues are persons who deserve credit, and that they all exactly agree in their story; 'twill not hence follow, those Bishops were Church Monarchs, and that they were the rulers of their Presbyteries. Bp. *Stillingfleet* has most fully and solidly confuted this pretence. I wish no one would henceforth build upon it, without first answering what he says about it. He shews, the same was the case among the *Archons* at *Athens*, and the *Ephori* at *Lacedemon*; the succession was reckon'd by the *Archon*, or *Ephorus*, ἐπώνυμος, though he had no superior power to the rest. From whence he infers: "That meer "succession of some single persons named above the rest, in "the successions in Apostolical Churches, cannot inforce "any superiority of power in the persons so named, above "others, supposed to be as joint governors of the Churches "with them. —— This argument from succession is weak, "and proves not at all the certainty of the power those "persons enjoy'd." † And altho' the successions in the Church are oftentimes thus briefly and summarily given, it being a tedious business to reckon up all the Presbyters that have ever been in any Church; yet the Fathers, when they speak of the successors of the Apostles in general, and dont need to speak so compendiously, use to speak not only of Bishops, but of Presbyters under that character; as I have before observ'd from *Ireneus*.

Clemens

* Acts xiv. 12. † Iren. p. 301.

Clemens Alexandrinus *takes notice of three distinct orders in his time, and makes Presbyters the second.*

Mr. *Blondel* has well explain'd *Clement*'s meaning, and shewn that he acknowledges only two orders of Ministry, and calls the same person a Presbyter, who, he had said just before, was made a Bishop by the Apostle. But 'tis best to set down his own words: "*Clement* gives the name of Pres-"byter to that servant of Christ, to whose care St. *John* had "committed the young man, and whom he had stiled Bi-"shop. For when he affirms, the Apostle used these "words: *O Bishop restore what I committed to your charge:* and "a little before, writing in *John*'s stile, says: *Looking up-*"*on the Bishop, who was set over them all, he said, I commit this* "*young man to thy care:* he presently adds: *The Presbyter* "*therefore receiving him*, &c." * As to the place cited by our Author, where *Clement* is suppos'd to make the *three distinct orders* of Ministers to be in imitation of the Angelical glory, it very much favours our cause; as is plain to any one, who considers what *Blondel* says upon it. For *Clement* acknowledges not three, but only two, as well angelical, as ecclesiastical ministries; as appears by this passage of his: "In "the Church the Presbyters bear that office, which makes "men better; the Deacons, that which is perform'd in at-"tending upon and serving them." [I conceive his meaning is, that whereas Presbyters were design'd to improve mens minds by instructing and teaching them; the Deacons were intended to serve them in external concerns. He then adds] "The Angels perform both these services to God." † [That is, by waiting on God, and doing his will, they may be consider'd as resembling the Deacons; by instructing men, they resemble the Presbyters.]

I will add two passages more, which *Blondel* has not taken notice of. The former of them clearly proves, Presbyters were in his time esteem'd the Pastors and Rulers of the Church: and consequently, according to the Episcopal scheme, endow'd with the power of ordination. For thus he, who himself was but an ordinary Presbyter of the Church of *Alexandria*, speaks of himself, and those of his station: "We "are shepherds, set over the Churches, according to the "example of the good shepherd; but you are the sheep." ‖ But if the Bishop alone is the Pastor, or Shepherd, and Ruler

* Apol. *p.* 36. † Strom. *lib.* vii. *p.* 701, 702. ‖ Pædag. *lib.* i. *c.* 6. *p* 99.

ler of his Church, as our Adversaries say, how could *Clement* speak after this rate concerning himself? The other testimony shews, that Presbyters used, in his time, to lay on hands in blessing persons; which must be either in confirmation, or in reconciling penitents; the power of performing which is thought to have belong'd only to those, who had the other power of ordination. His words are: "Upon whom shall a Presbyter lay his hand? whom shall "he bless? Not the woman thus adorn'd [with false hair] "but another person's hair; and in blessing that, he bless- "ses the head of that other person." *

Our Author next passes to *Origen*; but seeing he has not refer'd us to any place in him, I forbear to say any thing of him. If any one desires to know his mind, let him consult the learned *Blondel*. †

As to the Fathers of the succeeding ages, I shall not detain my reader with a particular examination of their testimonies. I readily grant what our Author asserts, that Bishops were then reckon'd superior to Presbyters. But if our *English* Bishops would follow the example of *Cyprian*, and do nothing without the consent of their Clergy, our controversy about Episcopacy would be soon over. But 'tis well known, *Jerom* was a stiff defender of our opinion. Wherefore since our Author has ventur'd to attack his reputation upon that account, I think 'twill not be improper for me briefly to defend it. Concerning him then the Doctor says thus:

At last came St. Jerom, *tho' not 'till above three Centuries after the Apostles times; who valuing himself upon his learning, which indeed was very great; and being provok'd by the insolence of some Deacons, who set themselves above Presbyters; to the end he might maintain the dignity of his order against such arrogant persons, he advanc'd a notion never heard of before,* viz. *That Presbyters were not a different order from Bishops; and that a Bishop was only a more eminent Presbyter, chosen out of the rest, and set over them for preventing of Schisms.* ‖

How untruly *Jerom* is represented as the first patron of our opinion, may appear by what I have said already. But who does not perceive, the Doctor speaks here out of prejudice? When *Jerom* overthrows the foundation of the Hierarchy, then he *values himself* haughtily *upon his learning*; but

* Pædag. *lib.* iii. *c.* 2. *p.* 248. † Apol. *p.* 28. ‖ *Page* 241.

but when it makes for our Adversaries purpose, his authority is equal to his learning. But I am afraid, our Author, *valuing himself upon his learning*, affirm'd that which he was not able to prove; namely, that *Jerom's* being *provok'd by the insolence of some Deacons*, was the first occasion of his embracing our opinion. This might be said with greater probability, if we were to learn what was his judgment in this matter only from his Epistle to *Evagrius*; but since he delivers the same in his other writings, how shall we be assur'd, he first fell into our opinion upon that occasion? By what arguments can it be prov'd, that *Jerom* did not write his Commentary upon *Titus*, and his Epistle to *Oceanus* (wherein he defends the same opinion) before he wrote his Letter to *Evagrius*, and so before that occasion was given? And altho' the Doctor here mentions *the insolence of some Deacons*, that he might represent the provocation as very great, by its being offer'd by several, combin'd together in a design; yet *Jerom* himself makes mention only of one obscure person, whom he speaks of with contempt. " We " read, *says he*, in *Isaiah*; *A foolish person will speak foolish* " *things*. * I hear of a fellow, who has broke out into " that extravagance, that he prefer'd the Deacons to " Presbyters, that is, to Bishops." Nevertheless we dont build so much upon *Jerom's* authority, as upon the strength of his arguments, which have never yet been fairly answer'd. But next comes a pleasant fancy concerning him.

But at last, when he grew more cool and considerate, he granted that Bishops succeeded in the room of the Apostles; and were as much above Presbyters, as Aaron *was above his sons.* And for the confirmation hereof, he cites, in his margin, that same Epistle to *Evagrius*. And is *Jerom's great learning* at last come to this, that he should be thought to write inconsistencies in so short an Epistle? While he was penning the beginning of his Epistle, he was so *provok'd*, that *he advanc'd a notion never heard of before, that Presbyters were not a different order from Bishops*; but by that time he got to the middle of his short Epistle, *he grew cool and considerate*; and then *he grants, the Bishops succeeded in the room of the Apostles*. But what shall we say to the latter end of his Epistle? Was he then afresh provok'd? Had he lost again his *coolness* and

* Isa. xxxii. 6.

and *consideration* ? Let Bp. *Crofts* of *Hereford* answer this : " And now I desire my reader, if he understand *Latin*, to " view the Epistle of St. *Jerom* to *Evagrius* : and doubt- " less he will wonder to see men have the confidence to " quote any thing out of it, for the distinction between " Episcopacy and Presbytery ; for the whole Epistle is to " shew the identity of them."* And if *Jerom* calls Bishops the successors of the Apostles, can he be thought to deny the same to be true concerning Presbyters ? Must not he necessarily assert the same thing of Bishops and Presbyters, who says, there is no distinction between them ?

But he produces another passage out of *Jerom*, to shew what he *granted after he was grown cool and considerate*. 'Tis taken from his Epistle to *Heliodorus*, wherein he says : *'Tis not easy to stand in the stead of* Paul, *to be of the same degree with* Peter, *who now both reign with Christ*. And thus *Jerom grows cool and considerate*, long before he could, according to our Author's opinion, have been provok'd. 'Tis certain that Epistle to *Heliodorus* was writ by him when he was very young, long before the other to *Evagrius*. This is attested by *Jerom* himself. " When I was a young man, *says he*, " and in a manner a boy, and was checking the first sallies " of my wanton age with the hardships of a wilderness " life, I wrote to thy uncle *Heliodorus* a Letter of exhorta- " tion, *&c.* † And by that Epistle itself it appears, *Jerom* was not ordain'd, when he wrote it ; whereas that to *Evagrius* was, by the Doctor's own confession, writ by him when he was a Presbyter. And altho' the words cited by the Doctor dont at all express that Father's opinion concerning our question ; yet 'tis evident by other passages in the Epistle, he was not then of the same mind, that he was afterward, when he wrote to *Evagrius*. To give therefore a just account of this matter : When *Jerom* was a youth, and almost a boy, he favour'd the tenets of the Episcoparians ; but when he was come to maturity of age, was ordain'd a Presbyter, and had spent much time and study in reading the Holy Scriptures, he acknowledg'd the truth of that opinion we defend ; and, for ought appears, he persisted in it to the end of his life.

Our Author adds : *In his Catalogue of writers, he owns* James *was ordain'd Bishop of* Jerusalem. *Jerom* there produces the words

* Naked Truth, *p.* 45. † *Epist.* 2. *to* Nepotian.

words of *Hegesippus*, who delivers that story. And if his being Bishop of *Jerusalem* be understood as I have explain'd it, none of our side will deny it.

Lastly, *Jerom*'s Epistle to *Nepotianus* is refer'd to, wherein he says: "We know the Bishop and Presbyters are, what "*Aaron* and his sons were." But this is not inconsistent with the judgment of *Jerom*, mention'd before. For in the same manner does he express himself in that very Letter to *Evagrius*, wherein he stoutly defends the equality of Bishops and Presbyters. "What *Aaron*, and his Sons, and "the Levites, were in the Temple; the same let Bishops, "Priests, and Deacons, claim to themselves in the Church." Dr. *Hammond* argued from this passage, that *Jerom* either maintain'd the divine right of Episcopacy, or else contradicted himself. But Bp. *Stillingfleet* gives a good answer to this: "The plain meaning then of *Jerom* is no more but "this: That as *Aaron* and his Sons, in the order of the "Priesthood, were above the Levites under the Law; so the "Bishops and Presbyters, in the order of the Evangelical "Priesthood, are above the Deacons under the Gospel. "For the comparison runs not between *Aaron* and his Sons "under the Law, and Bishops and Presbyters under the "Gospel; but between *Aaron* and his Sons, as one part of "the comparison under the Law, and the Levites under "them, as the other; so under the Gospel, Bishops and "Presbyters make one part of the comparison, answering "to *Aaron* and his Sons, in that wherein they all agree, "*viz.* the order of Priesthood; and the other part, under "the Gospel, is that of Deacons, answering to the Levites "under the Law." * Let the reader apply the same observation to the passage our Author has taken from his Epistle to *Nepotianus*, and he will easily see, 'twill as well fit that also. I will shut up this debate concerning the difference between Bishops and Presbyters, so far as it receives light from the Fathers, with the words of the same learned Bishop I just now mention'd. "As to the matter itself, "I believe, upon the strictest inquiry, *Medina*'s judgment "will prove true, that *Jerom*, *Austin*, *Ambrose*, *Sedulius*, *Primasius*, *Chrysostom*, *Theodorit*, *Theophylact*, were all of *Aerius* "his judgment, as to the identity of both name and order "of Bishops and Presbyters in the primitive Church."†

We

* Iren *p.* 268. † Iren. *p.* 276.

We now come to another kind of debate. Dr. *Nicholls* attempts to vindicate the titles and honours of our *Engliſh* Biſhops. Few of our ſide, eſpecially of late, have given our Adverſaries any trouble upon this head. For tho' we never lik'd Biſhops ſhould be entangled in ſuch offices and buſineſſes, as muſt of neceſſity draw away their minds from ſacred things; yet ſince the objection might ſeem invidious, they have ſeldom heard of it from us; except when they have forc'd us to take notice of it, by their mentioning it firſt of their own accord, and endeavouring to defend it by frivolous excuſes, rather than arguments; nor ſhould I have ſaid any thing about it, if our Author had paſs'd it over in ſilence. I deſire my readers to obſerve, the matter in debate is not, whether reſpect and honour is to be given to perſons in the ſacred office? A man muſt be a great ſtranger in our controverſy, who thinks we make any doubt of it. Nor are we much concern'd, that ſome Miniſters are diſtinguiſh'd from the reſt by thoſe honourable titles they ſo fondly ſeek. Let them, who are tickled with ſuch intiſements, keep to themſelves thoſe honours which to us ſeem no way neceſſary. The queſtion which is here chiefly in debate is: Whether Miniſters, and eſpecially thoſe, with whom alone, according to the judgment of our Adverſaries, the care of the flock is intruſted, ſhould be entangled with thoſe affairs of ſtate, that are moſt foreign to their function? Let us now ſee how our Author defends the Biſhops. Thus then he diſcourſes.

But by the Objectors leave, 'tis more reaſonable to ſay, that thoſe who are once inveſted with this high dignity in the Church, ſhould by no means decline the marks of honour annex'd to it. For ſuch titles and terms of reſpect are the main fences of authority, whereby the magiſtrates reputation and power are ſecur'd and guarded; it being natural for mankind to be much taken with whatever is ſplendid and glorious, and to yield a ready obedience to their ſuperiors, while they reject the government of their equals with contempt. 'Twas therefore wiſely provided by the laws, that Biſhops, who are to rule Presbyters in the Church, ſhould be adorned with the higheſt honours: becauſe if they were no better than common Eccleſiaſtics, they would be ſo far from governing their Clergy, that they would not be at all regarded by them.

Our Author has now ſpoke out plainly. But in the mean while what ſort of Biſhops are theſe, ſo obnoxious to contempt, that without theſe *annex'd marks* of honour they cannot eſcape it? Surely they are very different from the

the most antient Bishops; for they, without the help of any of these titles, preserv'd their reputation and authority well enough. Nor are they less unlike to the Pastors of the Reformed Churches abroad; who are not contemn'd by their flocks, notwithstanding they are not made Lords. But is it to be believ'd, that our Saviour was ignorant of this? or that he did not foresee his Ministers, without *these main fences of authority*, would, in time to come, fall into contempt? Shall we say he was so void of forecast, as never to secure his Ministers from that inconvenience; nay, that on the contrary he should warn them to beware of these honours? *But Jesus called them unto him, and said, Ye know that the princes of the Gentiles exercise dominion over them, and they that are great, exercise authority upon them. But it shall not be so among you: but whosoever will be great among you, let him be your minister: and whosoever will be chief among you, let him be your servant. Even as the Son of man came not to be ministred unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many.* * But I suppose 'tis enough for the Dissenters, and for ordinary Presbyters, to imitate our Saviour in that low estate, in which he liv'd while he was here on earth; but it becomes the Bishops to bear a resemblance of him according to his present circumstances, as he is exalted and glorified. But Christ himself has well taught his Ministers, to secure their authority in quite another method. Further, since our *English* Bishops have not only those titles of honour, but as Peers sit in the House of Lords to manage the great affairs of state, by what right can they attend upon these things? Will they also say the same thing was lawful for *Timothy*, who, as they pretend, was himself a Bishop? St. *Paul*'s words raise some doubt in my mind about it. *Thou therefore endure hardness as a good soldier of Jesus Christ. No man that warreth, entangleth himself with the affairs of this life; that he may please him, who hath chosen him to be a soldier.* † But if the opinion of the Episcoparians is true, *Jerom* had good reason to say a *Bishop* was a *name of dignity*. ‖ However, 'twas our Author's happiness, he had always the antients ready at hand for any service.

Nor, says he, *is their title of Lords unprecedented, having the practice of the primitive Christians to support it; who gave like honours to their Bishops, as being supreme governors in the Church.* ‡ For

---

* Matth. xx. 25, &c. comp. Luke xxii. 25, &c. † 2 Tim. ii. 3, 4.
‖ Epist. ad Evagr. ‡ *page* 242.

For the proof of this he alledges *the Epiſtle to* Julius *Biſhop of* Rome, *in* Sozomen, Book 3. c. 23. which is *inſcrib'd*: Τῷ Κυρίῳ μακαριωτάτῳ, *To the moſt happy Lord*: and ſome other paſſages of the like nature.

Who now can help perceiving, there is no ſhape antiquity cannot appear in; no purpoſe it cannot ſerve? What can there be, that may not after the ſame rate be defended by it? However, I can't but wonder more antient examples of this kind are not alledg'd, ſince they were not far to ſeek. What? ſhall we think *Julius Damaſus*, *Ambroſe*, and *Auguſtine*, Biſhops of the fourth Century, were the firſt who had the honourable title of Κύριοι, which our Author renders *Lords*, given to them? I muſt be ſo fair as to acknowledge, there are much older inſtances hereof. Thus *Philip*, *John* xii. 21, and *Paul* and *Silas*, *Acts* xvi. 30. are call'd Κύριοι, *Lords*. I hope our Countrymen will remember this, if ever they undertake a new tranſlation of the Bible; that they may take care to mend the faults of thoſe places, and change that civil compellation of *Sir*, which is in the preſent editions, into the more honourable one of *Lord*. Certainly our Author ſhould have prov'd, the Biſhops were antiently rank'd with the Nobles of their country; and that this title was not given them as a civil compellation, but as an expreſſion of their honourable quality. Every one knows, perſons of an ordinary rank uſed, both among the *Greeks* and *Romans*, to be beſpoke in this manner. And the Diſſenters are as much ſtrangers, as the Epiſcoparians, to the clowniſhneſs of the Quakers; and are ready to uſe this civil addreſs, not only to the Biſhops, but to any perſon who makes a tolerable figure in the world. But to ſpeak ſeriouſly; what valuable antiquity claims theſe civil honours and offices for Biſhops? The *Apoſtolical Canons*, as they are call'd, determine quite otherwiſe: "Let "not a Biſhop, Presbyter, or Deacon undertake worldly "buſineſs; otherwiſe let him be depos'd. * We have ſaid "a Biſhop ſhould not meddle with the adminiſtration of "public affairs, but attend upon eccleſiaſtical buſineſſes. "Let him therefore be perſuaded to forbear ſuch meddling; "or let him be depos'd. *For no man can ſerve two maſters*, "as our Lord has told us. † Let a Biſhop, a Presbyter, or a "Deacon, who goes into the army, and deſires to hold the "office of a *Roman* magiſtrate, and the prieſtly admini-"ſtration

* Can. 7. † Can. 81.

" ſtration together, be depos'd. For *the things of Cæſar* be-
" long *to Cæſar* ; and *the things of God, to God.*" * The ſame
orde: is given by the Councils of *Calcedon*, *Carthage*, *Mantz*,
and *Tibur*. The teſtimony of *Cyprian*, in this caſe, is very
remarkable : " Dear brethren, *ſays he*, I and my collegues,
" who were preſent, and our fellow Presbyters, who ſat
" with us, were very much troubled, when we knew that
" our brother, *Geminius Victor*, when he died, in his laſt will
" named a Presbyter to be guardian to his child ; it having
" been ſome time ſince order'd, in a council of Biſhops,
" that no man ſhould by his will make any of the Clergy,
" or God's Miniſters, a guardian or truſtee ; ſeeing all who
" are honour'd with the divine Prieſthood, and fix'd in the
" Miniſtry of the Clergy, ought to confine their ſervice to
" the altar and ſacrifices, and ſhould give themſelves to
" prayer. For 'tis written : *No man that warreth, entangleth*
" *himſelf with the affairs of this life ; that he may please him, who*
" *hath choſen him to be a ſoldier.* And ſince that is ſpoken
" of Chriſtians in general ; how much more ought not the
" Clergy to *entangle themſelves with the affairs and ſnarts of this*
" *life* ; who, being taken up about divine and ſpiritual af-
" fairs, are not to depart from the Church, and mind ſecu-
" lar and earthly buſineſſes ?" † And a little after, he ſays :
" They judg'd therefore, that no Brother, when he left the
" world, ſhould name any Clergyman to be guardian or
" truſtee ; and if any one did, no offering ſhould be made
" for him, nor ſhould any ſacrifice be obſerv'd for the year-
" ly commemoration of his departure." So that death it-
ſelf did not exempt men from puniſhment, who gave oc-
caſion to the Clergy to entangle themſelves in civil affairs ;
but a ſevere wound was given to their memory. *Chryſoſtom*
is yet more ſtrait handed to the Biſhops. His words de-
ſerve to be well obſerv'd by our Clergy, who often boaſt
mightily of him, and other antient writers. " I ſay (they
are his own words) " the Biſhops ſhould have nothing but
" food and raiment, that they may not have their deſires
" drawn out after theſe things." ‖

Further, when St. *Jerom*, as our Author tells us, in his Letters to St. *Auguſtine*, *ſtiles him : Domino vere ſancto & beatiſſimo Papæ Auguſtino : Aug. Epiſt.* 17, 18 : 'Tis evident, *Dominus* here muſt be underſtood in the more looſe and com-

E e mon

* Can. 83. † Epiſt. 1. *p.* 1. ‖ Hom. xv. in 1 Tim. *in cap* v. 17.

mon ſenſe, and anſwers to that title, we familiarly give to perſons we dont know, of *Sir*, or *Maſter*, &c. For the ſame *Jerom* has elſewhere well obſerv'd, that Biſhops ſhould conſider they are Prieſts, and *not Lords: non Dominos.* *

But ſo much for the Fathers. Let us next deſcend to more modern writers, I mean, to our Reformers, whoſe authority cannot be reaſonably rejected, ſince the Doctor in another place ſpeaks thus of them: *When we want authority for any of theſe things, we can quote our* Tyndals, Cranmers, Latimers, Hoopers, *moſt learned divines, and bleſſed martyrs.* † I ſhall therefore now bring all theſe as witneſſes and defenders of our opinion.

Let *Tyndal* be firſt heard, who uſes theſe words: "Let "them [Kings] rule their realms themſelves, with the help "of laymen that are ſage, wiſe, learned, and expert. Is "it not a ſhame above all ſhames, and a monſtrous thing, "that no man ſhould be found able to govern a worldly "kingdom, ſave Biſhops and Prelates, that are taken out "of the world, and appointed to preach the kingdom of "God?" And having cited *John* xviii. 36. *Luke* xii. 14: and ix. 62. *Matth.* vi. 24. he goes on thus: "To preach "God's word is too much for half a man. And to miniſ-"ter a temporal kingdom is too much for half a man alſo. "Either other requireth a whole man. One therefore can-"not well do both." ‖ And in another place: "Where-"fore if Chriſt's kingdom be not of this world, nor any "of his diſciples may be otherwiſe than he was; then "Chriſt's Vicars, which miniſter his kingdom in his bo-"dily abſence, and have the overſight of his flock, may be "none Emperors, Kings, Dukes, *Lords*, Knights, tempo-"ral Judges, or any temporal officer; or, under any falſe "names, have any ſuch dominion, or miniſter any ſuch "office, as requireth violence." ‡

Next to *Tyndal* follows *Cranmer*, who thus writes in a Letter to my Lord *Cromwel*: "Even at the beginning of "Chriſt's profeſſion, *Diotrephes* deſir'd *gerere primatum in ec-"cleſia, to have the preheminence in the Church*, as ſaith St. *John* "in his laſt Epiſtle. And ſince, he hath had more ſucceſ-"ſors, than all the Apoſtles had; of whom have come all "theſe glorious titles, ſtiles and pomps, into the Church. "But

* Epiſt. II. ad Nepot. † *Vid. p.* 176. ‖ Obedience of a Chriſtian Man: *in his words, p.* 124. ‡ The Pract. of the Popiſh Prelates, *p.* 342.

" But I would, that I, and all my brethren the Bishops, " would leave all our stiles, and write the stile of our offi- " ces, calling ourselves the Apostles of *Jesus Christ*: so that " we took not upon us the name vainly, but were so even " in deed: so that we might order our Diocess in such sort, " that neither paper, parchment, lead nor wax, but the " very Christian conversation, might be the letters and " seals of our offices; as the *Corinthians* were unto *Paul*, to " whom he said: *Ye are the letters and seals of our Apostleship.*" *

Another of the *blessed Martyrs*, whose authority the Doctor so highly values, is *Latimer*, who, in his Sermon of the *Plough*, speaks thus: " But this much I dare say, that since " *lording* and loitering hath come up, preaching hath come " down, contrary to the Apostles times. For they preach- " ed, and *lorded* not. And now they *lord*, and preach not. " ——Ever since the Prelates were made *Lords* and Nobles, " the plough standeth, there is no work done, the people " starve." A little after he speaks of the excuses they make: " They are otherwise occupied, some in Kings mat- " ters, some are Embassadors, some of the Privy Council, " some to furnish the Court, some are *Lords of the Parlia-* " *ment*, some are Presidents, and Comptrollers of Mints. " Well, well. Is this their duty? Is this their office? Is " this their calling? Should we have Ministers of the " Church to be Comptrollors of the Mints? Is this a meet " office for a Priest, that hath cure of souls? Is this his " charge? I would here ask one question: I would fain " know who comptrolleth the Devil at home in his parish, " while he comptrolleth the mint? If the Apostles might " not leave the office of preaching to be Deacons, shall we " leave it for minting? —— A Bishop hath his office, a " flock to teach, to look unto; and therefore he cannot " meddle with another office, which alone requireth an " whole man. He should therefore give it over to whom " it is meet, and labour in his own business, as *Paul* writeth " to the *Thessalonians*: *Let every man do his own business, and* " *follow his calling.* Let the Priest preach, and the Noble " man handle the temporal matters." †

The next witness is Bp. *Hooper*, from whom I shall transcribe the following passages: " Look upon the Apostles " chiefly, and upon all their successors, for the space of 400

* Stryp Life of Cranm. *Append. p.* 20. † Lat. Serm. *p.* 11, 12, 13.

" years, and then thou ſhalt ſee good Biſhops, and ſuch as " diligently applied that painful office of a Biſhop to the " glory of God, and honour of the realms they dwelt in. " Tho' they had not ſo much upon their heads as our Bi- " ſhops have, yet had they more within their heads, as the " Scriptures and hiſtories teſtify; for they applied all the " wit they had unto the vocation and miniſtry of the " Church, whereunto they were called. Our Biſhops have " ſo much wit, they can rule and ſerve, as they ſay, in " both ſtates; in the Church, and alſo in the civil policy. " When one of them is more than any man is able to ſa- " tisfy, let him do always his beſt diligence. If he be ſo " neceſſary for the court, that in civil cauſes, and giving " of good counſel, he cannot be ſpared; let him uſe that " vocation, and leave the other; for 'tis not poſſible he " ſhould do both well. 'Tis a great overſight of the Prin- " ces and higher powers of the earth, thus to charge them " with two burdens, when none of them is able to bear " the leaſt of them both. They be the King's ſubjects, and " meet for his Majeſty to chuſe the beſt for his court, that " be of the realm; but then they muſt be kept in their " vocation, to preach only the word of God, and not to " put themſelves, or be appointed by others, to do things " that belong not to a Biſhop's vocation." *

" They [the Biſhops] know, that the primitive Church " had no ſuch Biſhops, as be now a-days.† — If the fourth " part of the Biſhoprick remain'd unto the Biſhop, it were " ſufficient; the third part to ſuch as ſhould teach good " learning; the ſecond part to the poor of the Dioceſs; " and the other to maintain men of war for the ſafeguard " of the commonwealth; it were better beſtow'd a great " deal. For now it is ill uſed and beſtowed, for the great- " eſt part, upon thoſe that have no need of it; or elſe up- " on ſuch ill men, as ſhould be maintain'd with no man's " goods. It were well done to provide for ſuch, as, by ill " bringing up, cannot now otherwiſe live; and provide " ſuch means, that hereafter no more offend in that kind of " life. If any man be offended with me for my thus ſay- " ing, he loveth not his own health, nor God's laws, nor " man's, out of which I am always ready to prove the thing " ſaid to be true." ‖

And

* Upon the Commandm. *p.* 78. † Ib. *pag.* 74. ‖ Ib. *pag.* 75.

And have not now the Diſſenters good reaſon to glory, that theſe ſo very great men have been of the ſame opinion with them? Nor is it fair to repreſent this as our objection peculiarly, ſince the things objected againſt were diſpleaſing to our firſt Reformers, to the antient Fathers, and to our bleſſed Saviour himſelf. And altho' I have only alledg'd four of our Reformers, men whoſe authority was moſt valued by our Author; yet I could add abundance more of the Church's Biſhops, Presbyters, Martyrs, or Confeſſors. Such were *Frith*, *Mors*, *Bradford*, *Allin*, *Coverdale*, *Parker*, *Beacon*, and *Aylmer*, that I may name no more. But whoever deſires to ſee their teſtimonies, which are well worth reading, may conſult Mr. *Prynne*, to whom I am indebted for hinting ſeveral of theſe. *

The Epiſcoparians, as I have obſerv'd before, hold, every Biſhop is the only Governor and Paſtor in his Dioceſs, that is, his Church. But now, if we ſhould grant, that Chriſt appointed a Monarchical government in his Church; yet ſince ſome of their Churches are of ſuch a prodigious extent, as for inſtance, that of the Biſhop of *London*, which comprehends *Middleſex*, *Eſſex*, part of *Hertfordſhire*, and all the *Engliſh* colonies in both the *Indies*; we can never be perſuaded, that any ſingle perſon can be fit to govern ſo vaſt a Church. And we cannot but wonder any Proteſtant Divines, who have declar'd againſt the Pope's having the government of the Catholic Church, ſhould be ſo forgetful of ſome of their own arguments, as to claim ſo vaſt an authority for one *Engliſh* Biſhop. And yet our Author next proceeds to defend this great abſurdity.

But now, as to the bounds of antient Biſhopricks, compar'd with ours: whereas it is pretended, that the primitive Biſhops power was confin'd to one congregation; we anſwer in ſhort, that our Adverſaries are very much miſtaken, if they think the antient Biſhops power was limited to one ſingle village, or Church. †

It muſt be own'd, ſome Diſſenters have been of that opinion, that no ſingle Church ought to exceed the limits of one congregation. Nor are there wanting ſome plauſible arguments for that notion, as a very learned Gentleman of the long robe, now in one of the higheſt ſtations of his profeſſion, has ſhewn, in a Treatiſe, which our Adverſaries have not yet had time enough to anſwer, tho' it was printed five

* Antipathy, *p.* 361, &c. † *pag.* 243.

and twenty years ago. * But the account given of the Church of *Jeruſalem*, in the *Acts of the Apoſtles*, convinces me, and ſeveral more, that the other opinion is the truer; nor have the very learned and ingenious arguments of that author been able to drive us from it. As for my own part; I think Chriſt left the Church of *Jeruſalem* under the government of a plurality of Presbyters, all equal in dignity and power. The Apoſtles, following his example, ſettled the ſame order in all the Churches they founded. Hence each Church of old was govern'd by one Presbytery in common. So that a particular Church is to be limited after this manner: That as long as all the affairs of it can be manag'd by one ſuch Council of Presbyters, it ſhould remain one ſingle Church; but when it is ſo inlarg'd, that one ſingle Presbytery is not capable of hearing and determining the ſeveral caſes of all the members, that ſhould come before them; or that the Presbyters, living at ſuch remote diſtances from one another, cannot meet together to manage the affairs of the Church, as often as is needful; then a new Church, and a new Presbytery, ſhould be ſet up. But that two or more congregations in the ſame city, or neighbourhood, may be under one Presbytery, and ſo make but one particular Church, is a matter paſt doubt with me. And I deſire the reader to take notice, that thoſe, who are of the contrary opinion, did not ſeparate from the Conformiſts upon this account. For when King *Charles*, upon his reſtoration, had promis'd, in his Declaration, to take care that the Biſhops ſhould not for the future govern their Churches without the conſent and aſſiſtance of their Presbyters; our Miniſters, whether of the one opinion or the other, waited upon him publicly, with an Addreſs of thanks, and hop'd that this would produce a laſting peace. But this by the way.

Our Author next gives a reaſon of his opinion: *It being notorious that it* [the Biſhop's power] *extended at firſt all over the largeſt provinces. Not only the great city of* Epheſus, *but all* Aſia Minor *was* Timothy's *Dioceſs:* Titus *was Biſhop of the whole iſland of* Crete, *famous for its many Cities.* † Dr. *Nichols* thought it was *Chryſoſtom*'s judgment, that *Timothy* was by the Apoſtle conſtituted Biſhop of all *Aſia Minor*, and *Titus* of all *Crete*; otherwiſe what he ſays is nothing to the purpoſe.

* Inquiry into the Conſtitut. Diſcipl. &c. of the Primit. Church.
† Chryſoſt. in 1 Tim. v: & 2 Tim. iv. Id. in Tit. i.

poſe. For the queſtion under debate is this: Whether the primitive Churches were of the ſame extent with the *Engliſh* Dioceſſes? Whatever power Evangeliſts (as *Timothy* and *Titus* were) may be ſaid to have had in any Churches; yet all the writers for the Hierarchy grant, every Church ſhould have its own Biſhop; and many of them plead, according to *Cyprian's* judgment, that no one is a Biſhop over Biſhops.* Wherefore, if there were ſeveral Biſhops in *Aſia* and *Crete*, there muſt of neceſſity have been ſeveral Churches alſo. And ſince our Adverſaries hold, our Biſhops are ſucceſſors to *Timothy* and *Titus*, not as they were Evangeliſts, but as they were Biſhops; it only remains to be inquir'd, whether they acted as Biſhops in the whole region of *Aſia*, or *Crete*; that is, whether there were no other Biſhops beſide them in thoſe Countries? This is what our Author endeavours to prove, if I underſtand him right. Of the thing it ſelf I have treated before out of the Holy Scripture. Now we inquire, what *Chryſoſtom* thought of it. But 'tis certain, *Chryſoſtom* thought there were other Biſhops in *Crete*, beſide *Titus*. "*That thou mayeſt ordain Elders*, ſays the Apoſtle: "He means Biſhops. *In every city*, ſays he: for he would "not have the whole iſland committed to one man; but "that every one ſhould have and mind his own proper cure: "for ſo he knew the labour would be eaſier to him, and "the people to be govern'd would have more care taken "of them; ſince their teacher would not run about to go- "vern many Churches, but would attend to the ruling one "only, and ſo would keep it in good order." †

In like manner *Theophylact*: "He means here Biſhops, "as likewiſe in his Epiſtle to *Timothy*. He ſays, *In every "city*: for he would not have the whole Iſland committed "to one man; but that every city ſhould have its own "Paſtor: for ſo the labour would be the eaſier, and the "care taken of them the more exact." ‖

Nor does *Oecumenius* differ from them: "He had left "him, *ſays he*, having made him firſt a Biſhop himſelf, that "he ſhould ordain Biſhops in every city. ——— For he "would not have the whole iſland of *Crete*, being a large "one, committed to the care of one man; but that each "city ſhould have its own Paſtor. But the Biſhops he "here calls Presbyters." ‡

* In Concil. Carthag. † In Tit. i. 5. ‖ In loc. ‡ In loc.

So that 'tis clear, that *Chryſoſtom*, *Theophylact* and *Oecumenius*, thought the whole iſland was not committed to *Titus*, as the Biſhop thereof. *Chryſoſtom*'s words, in the beginning of that Homily, led our Author into his miſtake. There, he ſays: "This *Titus* was one of *Paul*'s company, well "eſteem'd of by him. For he would never have com- "mitted the whole iſland to him; he would never have "commanded him to ſupply what was wanting; (for he "ſays, *That thou ſhould'ſt ſet in order the things that are want-* "*ing*) nor would he have left to his judgment the making "ſo many Biſhops; if he had not plac'd a great confi- "dence in him." * And he diſcourſes to the ſame purpoſe elſewhere: "This *Titus*, *ſays he*, was a very extra- "ordinary perſon; ſo that the Apoſtle would commit a "whole iſland, and that a very large one too, I mean "*Crete*, to him."

Now theſe paſſages dont contradict what I alledg'd before out of him. *Chryſoſtom* aſſerts, St. *Paul* would not commit the whole iſland to *Titus*, as the ordinary and ſole Biſhop thereof; but that he left him there upon this account, that he ſhould go over the whole iſland, and plant a Church in every city, or ſet in order ſuch as were planted before, and ordain Elders in them; and perform, as ſoon as he could, ſuch other things, as the Apoſtle, by reaſon of the ſtraitneſs of his time, was hinder'd from doing himſelf. And when *Titus* had done thus, he was then (as *Chryſoſtom* ſeems to have thought) to undertake the government of one of thoſe Churches thus conſtituted. The reader may apply the ſame anſwer to what is alledg'd concerning *Timothy*. But if *Timothy* was the only Biſhop of *Epheſus* and all *Aſia Minor*, as our Author pretends; what will become of thoſe particular Churches of *Aſia*, I mean *Smyrna*, *Pergamus*, *Thyatira*, *Sardis*, *Philadelphia* and *Laodicea*? We muſt then, alas! loſe all theſe Churches; and, which is a much more melancholy thing, we muſt loſe their Biſhops alſo. Theſe things do not well agree with the ſentiments of the Epiſcopal party. After this rate, thoſe famous Churches, expreſly mention'd in Scripture, muſt have had no Biſhop but *Timothy*; nor a Biſhop and a Church any longer be look'd upon as related in that manner, which they uſe to pretend. Nay, *the Angels of the ſeven Churches* will be depriv'd

* Hom. x. *in* 2 Tim: *in* c. iv. 19.

depriv'd of their dignity, and be turn'd into meer Presbyters, the more to inlarge the authority and the Church of *Timothy*, their only Bishop.

But our Author produces some other examples from ecclesiastical History: Demetrius, *Bishop of* Alexandria, *had all* Egypt *for his province.* *

Eusebius's words are: "In the tenth year of *Severus*, *Letus* "had the prefecture of *Alexandria* and all *Egypt*; but *Deme-* "*trius* had lately succeeded *Julianus*, as Bishop over the pa- "rishes that were therein." But either Dr. *Nichols*, or *Eusebius* is greatly mistaken. For if only one Bishop rul'd all *Egypt*; how could *Dionysius*, who, after *Heraclas*, succeeded *Demetrius*, write letters to the Bishops of *Egypt*, to *Conon* of *Hermapolis*, *Ammon* of *Berenice*, and *Basilides* of *Pentapolis*? † Nay, *Pamphilus* and *Eusebius*, in their Apology for *Origen*, make mention of *Demetrius* and some other Bishops of *Egypt*. ‖ There were therefore more Bishops in that province; but the Bishop of *Alexandria* manag'd the affairs of the Church thro' all *Egypt*, *Thebais*, *&c.* as Archbishop, as *Epiphanius* observes; who mentions the Bishops of *Egypt*, and fully clears this matter. ‡ But now, since our Adversaries distinguish between an Archbishop's Province, and a Bishop's Diocess; we have no reason to believe, the limits of a Church are to be determin'd by the former of these.

Cyprian's *jurisdiction extended beyond the populous City of* Alexandria [falsely printed for *Carthage*] *all over the mighty provinces of* Numidia *and* Mauritania.

Cyprian's words, refer'd to, are: "But because our province "spreads it self very wide, for *Numidia* and both the *Mauri-* "*tania's* are join'd to it." * Our Author thought, *Cyprian*'s Church reach'd as far as the province in which he liv'd. The great absurdity of which must easily be discern'd by any one, who is conversant in his writings. *Cyprian* elsewhere speaks of *all the Bishops* that were *in his province*, or beyond the seas: † of *Agrippinus*, and the rest of his *fellow Bishops*, who at that time govern'd the Lord's Church in the *province* of *Africa* and *Numidia*: ‖ and of the Bishops that presided in *Numidia*. ‡ But what need many words? 'Tis certain from the Council of *Carthage*, there were many Bishops in *Numidia*, *Mauritania*,

* Euseb. E. H. *lib.* vi. *c.* 1. [*leg.* 2.] † Euseb. E. H. *lib.* vi. *c.* 47. *lib* vii. *c.* 26. ‖ *Vid.* Photii Biblioth. cod. cxviii. *p.* 298. ‡ Hær. lxviii. (*quæ est Meletian.*) *sect.* 1. * Epist. *l.* iv. *ep.* 8. *quæ est* 24 *in edit.* Oxon. † Epist. 43. ‖ Epist. 71. ‡ Epist. 72.

Mauritania, and *Zeugitana*, wherein *Carthage* ſtood. If any one queſtions it, he need only conſult the learned Biſhop of *Oxford*'s notes upon that Council. If it were not for this miſtake of *Cyprian*'s meaning, I ſhould hardly think it worth while to take notice, that it was the cuſtom in thoſe days for all the Biſhops in a province to meet together frequently, to conſult about eccleſiaſtical affairs. The province then, wherein *Carthage* was, contain'd *Zeugitana*, *Numidia*, and both the *Mauritania's*, and in each of them many Biſhops Churches.

Hitherto our Author has brought nothing, that makes for the defence of his cauſe; now therefore he betakes himſelf to the authority of *Socrates* and *Sozomen*, refering us to four places in them; three of which are falſe printed, and are not now mended in the Tranſlation.* But ſince I am paſt doubt, that city Churches at that time conſiſted of ſeveral congregations; and ſince I diſlike not they ſhould do ſo, I have no mind to diſpute about thoſe paſſages.

But I would here obſerve by the way; that our Author does not rightly conclude from *Cornelius* and *Optatus* compar'd together; *That every Presbyter in that city* [Rome] *had his proper Church and congregation to himſelf.* For the congregations at *Rome* had each of them two Presbyters to take care of them; as Dr. *Maurice* has obſerv'd out of *Hilary* the Deacon, and thinks no body took notice of this before himſelf: † tho' *Blondel* had made the ſame remark long before, and given many examples of it. || And *Valeſius* in vain endeavours to defend the opinion of *Baronius*, concerning this matter, againſt *Blondel*. ‡

Laſtly, our Author pretends, that *Jerom* appropriates the power of ordination to the Biſhops; becauſe in that famous Letter to *Evagrius*, wherein he has demonſtrated the identity of a Biſhop and a Presbyter, he ſays: *Quid enim facit, excepta ordinatione, Epiſcopus, quod Presbyter non faciat?* * But who can believe, that *Jerom*, the moſt learned of all the Fathers, ſhould in ſo very ſhort an Epiſtle write inconſiſtently? 'Tis but fair to admit any ſuch convenient explication of an author's words (eſpecially if he be a learned man) as will make him beſt agree with himſelf. But our Author makes a difficulty, where there is none. For *Jerom*'s

---

* *pag.* 244. † Def. of Dioceſ. Epiſ *p.* 47. || Apol. *p.* 224, 225. ‡ Not. in Euſeb. E. H. *lib.* vi. *c.* 43. * *pag.* 245.

Jerom's meaning is plain enough; who, when he here excepts ordination, does it upon the account of the cuſtom of the Church, not of any command of Chriſt. His words therefore are thus to be underſtood: *What does a Biſhop*, (now according to the preſent uſual practice of the Church) *except ordination, which a Presbyter may not do*? So that Biſhop *Crofts* did not without cauſe repreſent it as a vain and confident attempt, to fetch arguments from that Epiſtle, to eſtabliſh the diſtinction between Epiſcopacy, and Presbytery. *

CHAP. II.

Of Deans and Chapters.

IF a man compares the power which our Adverſaries ſay belongs to Biſhops, with their ordinary practice, he will find a conſiderable difference between them. For tho' they aſcribe to the Biſhops alone the power of government in the Church; yet they allow a large juriſdiction to Deans and Archdeacons, who are Clergymen; and to Chancellors and Commiſſaries, who are laymen. And which is ſtrange, they pretend antiquity for both. Dr. *Nichols* has here heap'd a great many things together, which are foreign to our controverſy, and ſo will need the leſs refutation. The firſt thing he pretends is, that we object againſt theſe things only out of *envy*.

For none of the Puritans, ſays he, *ever declaim'd againſt Cathedral dignities, till by their Schiſm they had cut themſelves off from all hopes and poſſibility of enjoying them.* Humphreys, Whittingham, *and* Fox, *chief men among them, could bear the inſide of a Cathedral well enough, till* Cartwright *made an abſolute defection and ſeparation from the Church.* †

The Tranſlator here has been guilty of an egregious blunder, by rendering: *Ante Schiſma a Cartwrighto ſuſceptum: Till* Cartwright *made an abſolute defection and ſeparation from the Church. Cartwright* made no ſeparation from the Church at all. But as to our Author, what he here ſays does not well hang together. For when the Puritans began to find fault with theſe offices, they had not *cut themſelves off from all*

* Naked truth, *p.* 44, 45. † *pag* 247.

all hopes and possibility of enjoying them. For some of the Puritans, as *Whittingham* and *Fox*, if not *Humphreys*, enjoy'd them at that time, and many years after. According to our Author's account, the *Admonitions* came out in 1572, and the last part of *Cartwright*'s Answer was printed in 1577. Now *Fox* died not before 1587, nor *Humphreys* before 1588. *

Further, if the revenues of those dignities were bestow'd as rewards and encouragements upon the most learned Divines, according to their respective merit, the Puritans would not have dislik'd them upon that account. But it troubled them, that idle persons, who excell'd not their neighbours in parts or industry, from whom nothing considerable could be expected, should be hired to lead an idle life with a great reward, which might be bestow'd to much better advantage for the Church and State: and that parish Ministers should be thus drawn away from their cures, being forc'd, according to the Canons, to reside a certain part of the year in their Cathedral Churches: † and lastly, that the rights belonging to Presbyters in general, should be granted to these alone. Thus the Dean and Chapter chuse the Bishop, or pretend to do it; for the King properly chuses him. But by what right do they arrogate this to themselves, and exclude the rest of the Presbyters? Our Adversaries do very ill in making first a difference between Bishops and Presbyters, and then another between Presbyters themselves, without the authority of either Scripture or antiquity.

But who, that is not an utter stranger in church History, doth not see that in the first ages, a good number of Presbyters, like our Prebends, had their residence about the Bishop in the head city of the Diocess, to be as it were his senate and council on all occasions?

We may well congratulate our Episcoparians their Deans and Chapters, since from them they are able to discern the usefulness of a Presbytery. We are truly fix'd in the opinion, that in each Church there was antiently *a good number of Presbyters*; which custom we think they, who came after, did ill to alter. That the Church was formerly govern'd by that council of Presbyters, together with their President, we learn from *Ignatius*, *Cyprian*, and such other antient authors; as 'tis also confirm'd by the testimonies pro-

* *See* Full. † *See* Can xlii. *of those of* 1603.

produc'd by our Author in his margin. How this agrees with what is said in the foregoing Chapter, concerning the power of Bishops, let others judge. But when he represented that *senate* or *council* as consisting of some Presbyters, who, *like our Prebendaries, had their residence in the head city*, while the other Presbyters, who belong'd to the same Church, were excluded; he should have taken care to prove this account by some good arguments. For we utterly deny there was any such practice in the first ages of the Church. Wherefore our Adversaries must prove, if they are able, that there were two sorts of Presbyters in the antient Church, of which the one made up this council, the other having nothing to do in it; or else they must acknowledge the far greatest part of their Presbyters have lost that honour, which formerly belong'd to their office. And if the Office of these Canons is consider'd, according to the state 'tis now in, they can really in no sense be said, as a senate or council, to assist the Bishop. A Bishop is no more oblig'd to ask advice of them, than of any of the rest of his Presbyters, or of the laity. The offices and jurisdictions of Bishops, and Deans are distinct; and so in the exercise of their authority, the Deans are no more subject to the Bishops, than the Bishops are to the Deans.

What follows in our Author, abundantly confirms our opinion, that Dioceses, or Churches, of so large an extent, ought not to be committed to a single Bishop. But when he says in behalf of these Deans and Prebendaries, that they *live about* the Bishop, that *their authority and advice may stand him in great stead* upon occasion; * therein he imposes upon his readers; for this is neither requir'd by the law, nor found true by experience. In a word, these Deans and Prebendaries are of no manner of use, but oftentimes a hindrance to the Bishops in governing their Dioceses. And therefore when the late Bishop *Burnet* said to a Doctor, just after his preferment to the Deanery: That whereas there us'd to be quarrelling between the Bishops and Deans of *Salisbury*, he hoped they two should live in peace: the new Dean gave him this answer: *My Lord, I can't imagine why we should not, since your Lordship has nothing to do with me, nor I with your Lordship.* Our Author was sensible what he has hitherto said was a poor defence, and therefore he endeavours to defend these Deans and Chapters another way.

But

* *page* 249.

But supposing there were no need of their prudence, to assist the Bishop in the affairs of his Diocess: We apprehend the Dean and Chapter are not oblig'd to assist the Bishop, nor the Bishop to seek their help or advice, according to the constitution of the Church of *England*. If the matter be otherwise, it ought to be made appear; else what he said just before is superfluous. But let us see what use they serve for, since they are of none in the government of the Church: *yet it would be for the interest of the Church, that such a body of Presbyters should live together in the Cathedral of the Diocess, if it were but to attend on the daily service of the solemn Prayers.* And must men be hired at so dear a rate, to be present at the Prayers of the Church? In parochial Churches, where only two or three Ministers have salaries, prayers are read often enough. But here the prayers are more *solemn*; namely, by reason of the curious singing of the Choristers, and the melody of the Organs, which is the subject of the next Chapter, and is, according to our proverb, *More cost than worship.* The Doctor adds: *That such service being duly and regularly perform'd here, might serve for a pattern to Ministers in more remote parts of the province:* * God forbid! May that *solemn* singing at least be confin'd to the Cathedrals; tho' it were much better laid aside in them also. But if once it should spread it self, together with its appurtenance of Choristers and Singing-men, into our parochial Churches, we may bid adieu to religion and piety. *that the laity's omissions in this duty might be aton'd for, in some measure, by the Clergy's great diligence.* I wonder our Author did not here also appeal to the antient writers. For who does not know, that our Ancestors some ages ago were of that opinion, that the Clergy ought to have a stock of merits, ready to clear the score of the people's sins? A most gainful doctrine this has been to the Clergy, as the Papists find it to this very day. And if it were certainly true, I should think the wisdom and prudence of our nation deserv'd great commendation, that has so prettily provided by a public charge, that no one should miss of a share in these hired merits: nor should I think the advantage dear, at any price that would purchase it.

But perhaps these men are exceeding useful, as our Author next pleads, by their *frequent preaching*. Nor indeed

* page 250.

deed will I deny, they may be of some use in this respect. But whoever compares the number of sermons they preach, with the profits they receive, will readily own they are well rewarded for their pains; and that they cannot make amends for the mischief done in those Cathedral towns and cities, by the tribe of Singing-men, Organists, and such like fellows.

In the next place, our Author proceeds to describe these Dignitaries, as so many *Gaius*'s, hospitably entertaining both the Clergy and the laity. * But tho' I have not heard much proof of this, I will not particularly examine what he says, since it might seem invidious.

But besides, there is a further use of Cathedral dignities, viz. *That the more learn'd Divines may have encouraging rewards before their eyes, to incite and stir them up to more than ordinary pains in their studies.* They would deserve great commendation upon this account, if they were truly bestow'd according to mens merit. But the Doctor presently acknowledges they are not: *And whereas persons of no greater merits than their neighbours, do sometimes enjoy these preferments; the fault is not to be laid upon the Church, but rather upon the common error of all nations and ages, in which ambitious and confident men have ever insinuated themselves into the favour of the great ones; and by assuming much to themselves, and allowing little to those that deserve better, have aim'd at these very preferments, and left no stone unturn'd, to obtain them speedily.* † Since then, slothful and ignorant men sometimes enjoy these preferments, and the Church has taken no care to prevent it; without doubt she must be in the fault that they obtain them, who are unworthy of them.

There is yet one argument more our Author makes use of: *If it were not for these Cathedral preferments, we should have nothing in the Church to confer upon learned Foreigners. For they scarce ever attain to such a mastery in our language, as to be fit for preaching, and other duties of parochial Cures. But several of them have found an honourable refuge in our Cathedrals, when they have left their own country for the love of our Church, or been forc'd from it by the severity of their Prince.* ‖ What a wretchedly poor nation has he now made us! Who can believe the *English* have no other way of providing for foreign Refugees? The *Dutch*, and other Reform'd countries,

* *pag.* 251. † *Vid. p.* 253. ‖ *pag* 252.

tries, tho' they have none of these dignities, have yet honourably entertain'd and provided for many of our Brethren, who fled out of *France*, for the sake of their religion. And indeed, so few Foreigners have ever obtain'd any of these dignities, that this must needs be look'd upon as a feign'd excuse, that has nothing in it.

But since these Deans and Chapters have nothing, as we have seen, in antiquity to defend them; some may inquire, Whence had they their original? In that, Bishop *Burnet* informs us: "The Deans and Chapters, *says he*, had their "authority at first by Papal Bulls, and have now their "exemptions and jurisdictions continu'd to them only by a "Proviso, in the Statute of the 25th of *Henry* VIII." * And he affirms they do all the acts of Episcopal jurisdiction.† Which, as I observ'd before, is very contrary to the Episcopal scheme.

I will conclude this Chapter with the words of the great Mr. *Calvin*. "Those Cathedral dignities are of no use at "all for the true government of the Church; much less "Chancellorships, and the rest of those rascally offices. "Where shall we then place them? Truly the word of "Christ, and the practice of the primitive Church, ex-"cludes them from the honour of Presbyters. And yet "they say they are Presbyters: but we must pull off the "mask; so we shall find their profession widely different, "and most remote from that office of Presbyters, which "the Apostles describe to us, and was found in the antient "Church. And therefore, since all such kind of offices, "whatever titles they are honour'd with, are newly in-"vented, having no foundation in any divine appointment, "or in the antient practice of the Church; they ought to "have no place in the description of that spiritual govern-"ment, which the Church has receiv'd, as being made "sacred by the word of the Lord himself. Or if they "would have me speak more plainly and coarsly: Since "Commissaries, Canons, Deans, and such like idle fel-"lows, do not, with so much as their little fingers, touch "any part of that office, which is necessarily requir'd in "Presbyters; 'tis not to be born, that they should, by false-"ly assuming that honour, profane the holy institution of "Christ." ‖

CHAP.

* Reflect. on Atterb. Book of the Rights, &c. of a Convocat. *p.* 10. † Ibid. *p.* 11. ‖ Instit. *lib.* iv. *c.* 5. *sect.* 10.

CHAP. III.

Of Singing and Musick in Churches.

THere are three things which we must here carefully distinguish; and the rather, because they are confounded by our Author. First, Plain Singing, which we affirm has been in use from the beginning of the Church, and is grounded upon the example of our Saviour, and the command of his Apostles. Secondly, Cathedral or Antiphonal Singing, which we take to be neither useful, nor very antient, being the device of the fourth Century. Lastly, Musical Instruments, join'd with Singing in the Church, which we say are the invention of a yet much later age, *viz.* the thirteenth or fourteenth age of the Church. Now let us hear our Author.

They should consider how unjustly they condemn vocal and instrumental musick, which even nature, by a tacit approbation, has brought into use. * We never *condemn vocal musick*, without which there can be no singing. Nay, our Author himself tells us, *We are for the most part extremely addicted to singing Psalms.* † How do these things then agree? But let us go on with him:

For, says he, *not to enter into the fictions of the poets*, [namely in the ages most venerable for antiquity] *concerning it, how woods and wild beasts have follow'd it, and the dead been rais'd by it; we find, by our own observation, that brute creatures are sensible of it, and stand still to hear it.* 'Tis a wonder he should here omit to mention the antient writers of the Church, of whom he uses continually to boast. For not only the fabulous poets, but some of these also, have long ago made the same observation. So *Clement* of *Alexandria* says, deer and horses are delighted with musick. But what he there adds is very remarkable, that these instruments *are fitter for beasts than men.* ‖ But the Doctor reckons up yet more of the admirable effects of musick: *That barbarity itself is mollified by an harmonious variety of sounds; that unsociable retir'd people may be prevail'd on by it to leave their solitude, and be pleas'd with our company and diversions.* ——

* *p.* 254. † *p.* 256. ‖ Pædag. *l.* ii. *c.* 4 *p.* 163.

Now, since our souls are so much accustom'd to worldly matters, as to be very cold and slow to the love of God; we have need of such helps as these, to warm our affections, and put them in motion. That there is a great force in music, and that it wonderfully pleases men, is certain. Nor are we so unmusical as to deny it. But the question is: Whether it be fit for the worship of God; or can, by its own virtue, excite devout and spiritual affections in us? Plain singing we acknowledge is pleasing to God, and serves to raise pious affections, because 'tis commanded under the New Testament: nor can that, I think, be doubtful to any Christian. But from a general command concerning singing, it does not presently follow, that we must use musical Instruments in our worship: that surely must be prov'd by other arguments. Nor is it enough, that they are able to stir and chear our minds; for 'tis not lawful for us to bring in all such things, of our own heads, into God's worship. Who knows not, that wine has the like virtue, to chear mens minds, and warm their affections? And yet 'tis unlawful to use it in the worship of God, except where 'tis commanded, in the Lord's Supper. Vain therefore are the allegations of our Author, in defence of his Party upon this head. And unless our Adversaries can prove, that our minds are carry'd toward spiritual and heavenly things, by some hidden virtue, that nature has planted in these musical Instruments, or by a certain divine grace accompanying them, as God's own institutions; they really say nothing to the purpose. But it may not be amiss here, to take notice of an observation, which our Author makes elsewhere, and which is very pat to our present purpose. "The Christian religion, *says he*, shines brightest in its "own native dress; and to paint it, is but to deform "it." *

For these reasons Music was used in the Temple at Jerusalem, *by the appointment of God himself.* † The Translator has here mended our Author, who says, in the *Latin* edition: *For these reasons the antient Church of God used Music in their worship, in the Temple at* Jerusalem, *God himself approving of it.* This I take to be a great mistake.

For the *Jews* us'd not music in their worship for any such reasons, as our Author has before alledged; but only, because

---

* *page* 331. † *page* 255.

becauſe God had commanded them ſo to do; as the Scripture moſt expreſly teſtifies. *And he ſet the Levites in the houſe of the Lord, with Cymbals, with Pſalteries, and with Harps, according to the* commandment *of* David, *and of* Gad *the King's Seer, and* Nathan *the Prophet; for ſo was the* commandment of the Lord *by his Prophets.* * God had forbid the *Jews*, to bring any thing into his worſhip of their own head. Hence he not only ſhew'd to *Moſes* the pattern of the Tabernacle, and of all the utenſils thereof: but when the Temple was to be built at *Jeruſalem*, he ſhew'd to *David*, by his Spirit, both the form of it, and all the inſtruments to be uſed in it. As to the Tranſlator, who would ſeem to turn the expreſſion to import, that God for our author's reaſons appointed the *Jews* to uſe theſe muſical inſtruments; I will then believe, he knows what God's reaſons were, when he ſhall pleaſe to inform us, in what part of his word he has acquainted him with them. No man now will wonder *our Bleſſed Saviour, who reproves all ſuperſtitious rites and innovations which he found introduc'd into that Church*, ſhould *ſay not a word againſt Muſic*; ſince it was expreſly appointed by God himſelf; and ſo could not be reckon'd a *ſuperſtitious rite*, or an *innovation introduced into that Church*. But it does not hence follow, that he would have it continu'd in that Evangelical worſhip he appointed. But at length our Author propoſes what we really object.

But now, that the ceremonies of the Jewiſh *law are aboliſh'd, it ſeems not very agreeable to Chriſtian ſimplicity, that in our graveſt aſſemblies, there ſhould be ſuch chanting of Voices and Organs, Singing Men and Boys, taking their turn on each ſide the Quire.* To which he anſwers: *But why do theſe Objectors condemn themſelves by their own practice? For they are, for the moſt part, extremely addicted to ſinging Pſalms; and ſuch Pſalms as are very much vary'd from the Original, by the meaſures and rhymes into which they are put.* † Singing, as I ſaid before, is a duty commanded in the New Teſtament: hence ſome muſical meaſures are neceſſary, ſince without them it cannot be perform'd. We therefore obey a divine command by ſinging *David*'s Pſalms, not *as they came out of his mouth*,

* 2 Chron. xxix. 25. *See alſo* Exod. xxv. 9, 40. xxvi. 30. xxvii. 8. Numb. viii. 4. Deut. iv. 2. v. 32. xii. 32. Joſh. i. 7. Exod. xxv. 1 Chron. xxviii. *from ver.* 11. *to the* 19. *Compare alſo*, 1 Chron. viii. 13, 14. *and* xxx. 12.

† *Page* 236.

as the *Latin* edition obſerves; that is, not in *Hebrew*, but turn'd into *Engliſh* metre. But by what divine command are muſical inſtruments, in the worſhip of God, to be defended?

Now, who is ſhrewd enough to give a good reaſon, why inſtrumental Muſic ſhould be lawful in the Jewiſh *Church, and vocal unlawful in ours?* No body pretends to it, good Mr. Tranſlator. Nor did our Author write ſo childiſhly as you repreſent him. Who asks, *who is ſhrewd enough to give a good reaſon, why inſtrumental Muſic ſhould be reckon'd a* Jewiſh *ceremony, and vocal Muſic ſhould not?* And in anſwer to him, I ſay: There is no great need of ſubtilty, to give a good reaſon for this difference, which is ſufficiently plain of itſelf. For, if both theſe were antiently number'd among the *Jewiſh* ceremonies, neither of them is to be uſed, as ſuch, under the New Teſtament. One, therefore, we reject as a *Jewiſh* ceremony; the other, we retain as the inſtitution of Chriſt. And certainly a man muſt be blind, who does not ſee, that Trumpets, Harps, and ſuch like muſical inſtruments, belong'd to the pomp and ceremony of the *Jewiſh* worſhip. Now all theſe things are abrogated, together with the law that appointed the worſhip; unleſs any of them appear afreſh injoin'd by ſome particular command. Further, our Author miſtakes in thinking we judge it unlawful to ſing *David*'s Pſalms in proſe, as he hints afterward. We only ſay, that kind of ſinging uſed in Cathedrals is ſo curious and difficult, that 'tis beyond the capacity of the common people; and ſo is not adapted to the edification of the Church.

That which further vindicates the way of Singing we are pleading for, is the practice of the primitive Church. * Could our Author think us perſons, ſo very eaſy to be deceiv'd? If *almoſt all antiquity*, as his own expreſſion is, vindicates this way of Singing; why has he not alledg'd ſo much as one word out of antiquity in the behalf of it? This is a variation from his uſual cuſtom, who upon other occaſions is wont to dun us with the teſtimonies of the antients, which are little or nothing to the purpoſe. But I will preſently pull off this maſk of antiquity, under which he ſo often tries to hide himſelf, when I come to ſhew, the uſe of muſical inſtruments has been but very lately brought into the Chriſtian

* *page* 257.

Christian Church. But first I will consider what he says of the *Antiphonal* way of Singing.

And it is probable, that the very first worship in the Christian assemblies was perform'd by such singing of Psalms; for Pliny *mentions nothing else they did there, but sing Hymns,* secum invicem, *by turns, or in parts, to Christ as to God.* Our Author would never have thought this passage was to his purpose, if he had not read it with a party prejudice. Of all the Critics, whose Comments upon that Epistle of *Pliny* I have met with, *Cataneus*, an *Italian* Papist, is the only man who takes notice of this way of Singing, tho' they use not to omit any thing relating to the customs of the antients. Dr. *Nichols* thinks those words, *dicere secum invicem*, signify *to sing by turns*, or *in parts*. I think they mean no more than *to sing together*; or, as *Vossius* explains him: "His meaning is, that "the Priest was not the only person who sang; but others "singing also, they stir'd up one another. Whence *Tertul-*"*lian*, in his *Apology*, *c.* 39. after he had spoke of their "Love Feasts, adds: *After we have wash'd our hands, and the* "*candles are lighted, every one is desir'd to sing to God in the* "*midst of the company, according as he is able, either out of the* "*Holy Scriptures, or somewhat of his own composing.*" Nay, *Tertullian*, in another place in the same *Apology*, gives an account of the Christian solemnities, from this passage of *Pliny*; but says not a word of this Singing by turns. "We find, "*says he*, it has been forbidden to make a search after us. "For when *Plinius Secundus* was governor of a province, "and had condemn'd some, and made others comply, be-"ing disturb'd by the great multitude of the Christians, he "consulted the Emperor *Trajan*; acquainting him, that, "besides an obstinate aversion to sacrificing, he could dis-"cover nothing concerning their mysteries [*de sacramentis*] "but that they held assemblies before day, to sing to Christ "and [or *as*] God, *&c.*" *

The Antiphone, *or chanting of the Psalms by turn, is taken notice of by* Socrates, *as a very early practice of the Eastern Churches; for he makes St.* Ignatius *to be the author of it.*

That must be a rare cause, that needs such fabulous stories to defend it. *Socrates* himself owns, he tells this story upon a common report, which we all know is little to be credited in such matters; and perhaps he himself did not

* See Chap. 2.

believe it. Thus he concludes his relation: "And such is "the report concerning these Antiphonal Hymns." And if this story has any truth in it, how came it to pass, that it should never be mention'd in the least by *Ignatius*, in his *Epistles*, by the Writer of the account of his Martyrdom, or by any other author before *Socrates*? But to *Socrates* I oppose *Theodorit*, as antient a writer, and as good a witness; who tells us, *Flavianus* and *Diodorus* were the first authors of this usage. "These first, *says he*, divided the Quires into "two parts, and taught the singing *David*'s Psalms by turns. "This, being first begun at *Antioch*, soon spread itself "through the whole world." * Now this happen'd about the middle of the fourth Century. Further, tho' I always thought *Socrates* a very useful writer, yet I cannot believe he deserves much credit, when he gives an account of several of the miracles and visions of the antients; especially when I consider what a wretched fable, of *Helena*'s finding Christ's Cross, he has inserted into his *History*, as tho' it deserv'd to be believ'd. † Now if what he relates of *Helena* is not to be credited, much less is what he tells us of *Ignatius*, who liv'd at a much greater distance from his own time. Finally, in what prodigious danger must religious worship be, if it is to be order'd according to such uncertain visions? *Tertullian* thought quite otherwise of these visions, when he explain'd the θρησκεία τῶν ἀγγέλων, which the Apostle condemns, ‖ not as meant of the giving worship to Angels, but of the worship taught by them. "If, *says he*, he blames some, who told them, from the "visions they had of Angels, that they were to abstain "from meats: *Touch not*, &c. ‡

And it was soon received in other places. I grant, it spread very much, after it was once set on foot. But this was not till the middle of the fourth Century. Nor are any more antient authors of it to be found, than *Flavianus* and *Diodorus*, who were both of them laymen, when they invented it. And in one of them, *viz. Flavianus*, our Adversaries have no great cause to triumph; since he was guilty afterwards of gross perjury. *

And none of the antient Fathers mention it otherwise, than as a very laudable and pious usage.

To prove this, he cites *Basil*; tho' in the passages refer'd to,

---

* E. H. *lib.* ii. *c.* 24. † *Lib.* i. *c.* 17. ‖ Col. ii. 18. ‡ Adv. Marc. *lib.* v. *c.* 19. * Soz. *lib.* vii. *c.* 3 & 11.

to, he is ſpeaking of Singing in general, and ſays not a word of this alternate way. *See Baſil. Hom. in Pſalm.* 1. *p.* 126, 127. But tho' *Baſil* ſays nothing of it in that place, yet it muſt be own'd he zealouſly defended it; as in his Epiſtle to the Clergy of *Neoceſarea*, who were much offended at the bringing in of this uſage. * Nor does he deny, that the antient manner of Singing was alter'd in his Church. Farther, not only the Clergy of *Neoceſarea*, but *Auguſtine* alſo, judg'd not this uſage to have been *very laudable and pious.* " The pleaſing my fleſh, which I ſhould not ſuffer to " weaken my mind, often deceives me, while my ſenſe " does not ſo accompany my reaſon, as patiently to follow " it; but endeavours to outrun and lead it, tho' it is only " to be minded for the ſake of the other. And ſo in theſe " things I ſin, not perceiving it, tho' I perceive it after- " wards. Sometimes, while I guard exceſſively againſt " this deceit, I err thro' a too great ſeverity; but this is " very ſeldom. So that I wiſh all the nice Singing of *Da-* " *vid*'s Pſalms were remov'd from mine and the Church's " hearing; and that ſeems ſafer to me, which I remember " I have been often told of *Athanaſius* the Biſhop of *Alexan-* " *dria*, who made the reader of the Pſalm ſound it with ſo " little alteration of his voice, that he was more like to " a perſon delivering a ſpeech, than ſinging." † Nor do the words of *Jerom* much favour this Cathedral way of Singing: " We muſt therefore ſing, and make melody, and " praiſe the Lord, rather with the heart, than the voice. " For this is what is here ſaid: *Singing and making melody in* " *your heart to the Lord.* Let young men mind this; let " them mind it, whoſe office is to ſing in the Church. We " muſt ſing to God, not with the voice, but the heart. " They are not artfully to ſupple their jaws, and their " throat, after the manner of the tragedians, that theatrical " notes and ſongs ſhould be heard in the Church; but " they are to praiſe God with fear, with good works, and " the knowledge of the Scriptures. If a man has an un- " pleaſant voice, if he has good works, he is a ſweet ſinger " in God's ears. Let the ſervant of Chriſt ſo ſing, that " not the voice of the ſinger, but the thing ſung may " pleaſe; that the evil ſpirit, that was in *Saul*, may be caſt

* Epiſt. 63. † Confeſſ. *lib.* x. *c.* 33.

" out of thoſe, who in like manner are poſſeſſed by him;
" and not be let into thoſe, who have turn'd the houſe of
" God into a ſtage." * But what would *Jerom* have ſaid, if he had ever been preſent at ſuch Cathedral Singing as ours?

Further, the two and thirty Commiſſioners, appointed by King *Edward* VI. who were the moſt eminent perſons in the nation, either for divinity or law, found fault with this manner of Singing, and advis'd the laying it aſide. Hear what they ſay themſelves: " In reading Chapters, and
" ſinging Pſalms, Miniſters and Clergymen muſt think of
" this diligently; that God is not only to be prais'd by
" them, but that others are to be brought to perform the
" ſame worſhip, by their counſel and example. Where-
" fore let them pronounce their words diſtinctly, and let
" their Singing be clear and eaſy, that every thing may be
" underſtood by the auditors. So that 'tis our pleaſure,
" that the quavering, operoſe Muſic, which is call'd *figur'd*,
" ſhould be wholly laid aſide; ſince it often makes ſuch
" a noiſe in the ears of the people, that they can't under-
" ſtand what is ſaid " †

And ſo much for this Cathedral way of Singing. I come now to ſay ſomewhat of the antiquity of Muſical Inſtruments. But that theſe were not uſed in the Chriſtian Church in the primitive times, is atteſted by all the antient writers with one conſent. Hence they figuratively explain all the places of the Old Teſtament, which ſpeak of Muſical Inſtruments; as I might eaſily ſhew by a thouſand teſtimonies, out of *Clement* of *Alexandria*, *Baſil*, *Ambroſe*, *Jerom*, *Auguſtine*, *Chryſoſtom*, and many others. I can hardly forbear laughing, when I meet with ſome of their allegorical interpretations. Thus, an Inſtrument with ten ſtrings, according to them, ſignifies the Ten Commandments, as the unknown author of the Commentary upon the *Pſalms*, among *Jerom*'s works, often explains it. ‖ But the pleaſanteſt fancy is the explication of thoſe words: *Praiſe him with ſtringed Inſtruments and Organs.* ‡ " That the guts being twiſted by
" reaſon of abſtinence from food, and ſo all carnal deſires
" being ſubdu'd, men are found fit for the kingdom of God,
" to ſing his praiſes." But *Chryſoſtom* talks more handſomly: " As the *Jews* prais'd God with all kind of Inſtruments;

" ſo

* In Eph. v. 19. † Reform. Leg. Eccl. tit. De Div. Offic. c. 5.
‖ *In* Pſ. xxxii. 2. xliii. 4, &c. ‡ Pſ. cl. 4.

" ſo we are commanded to praiſe him with all the mem-
" bers of our bodies, our eyes, *&c.*" * And *Clement* of *Alexandria* talks much to the ſame purpoſe. †

Beſides, the antients thought it unlawful to uſe thoſe Inſtruments in God's worſhip. Thus the unknown author of a Treatiſe, among *Juſtin Martyr*'s works: " Q. If ſongs were
" invented by unbelievers with a deſign of deceiving, and
" were appointed for thoſe under the Law, becauſe of the
" childiſhneſs of their minds; why do they, who have re-
" ceiv'd the perfect inſtructions of grace, which are moſt
" contrary to the foreſaid cuſtoms, nevertheleſs ſing in the
" Churches, juſt as they did, who were children under the
" Law? *Anſw.* Plain Singing is not childiſh, but only the
" Singing with lifeleſs Organs, with Dancing and Cymbals,
" *&c.* Whence the uſe of ſuch Inſtruments, and other
" things fit for children, is laid aſide, and Plain Singing
" only retain'd." ‖

Chryſoſtom ſeems to have been of the ſame mind, and to have thought, the uſe of ſuch Inſtruments was rather allow'd the *Jews* in conſideration of their weakneſs, than preſcrib'd and commanded. ‡ But that he was miſtaken, and that Muſical Inſtruments were not only allow'd the *Jews*, as he thought, and *Iſidorus* of *Peluſium*, (whoſe teſtimony I ſhall mention preſently) but were preſcrib'd by God, may appear from the Texts of Scripture I have before refer'd to.

Clement, as I have mention'd already, thought theſe things fitter for beaſts, than for men. And tho' *Baſil* highly commends, and ſtifly defends the way of Singing by turns; yet he thought muſical Inſtruments unprofitable and hurtful. He calls them, *the inventions of* Jubal *of the race of* Cain. And a little after, he thus expreſſes himſelf: " *Laban*
" was a lover of the Harp, and of Muſic, with which he
" would have ſent away *Jacob*: *If thou hadſt told me*, ſaid
" he, *I would have ſent thee away with mirth, and muſical inſtru-*
" *ments, and an Harp.* But the Patriarch avoided that mu-
" ſic, as being a thing that would hinder his regarding
" the works of the Lord, and his conſidering the works of
" his hands." * And a little before, he ſays thus: " In
" ſuch vain arts, as the playing upon the Harp, or Pipe, or
" dancing,

---

* *In* Pſ. cl. † Pædag. *lib.* ii. *c.* 4. ‖ Reſp. ad Orthodox. Q. 107.
‡ *In* Pſ. cl. * Comment. in Iſ. *c.* v. *p.* 96, 957

" dancing, as ſoon as the action ceaſes, the work itſelf va-
" niſhes. So that really, according to the Apoſtle's expreſ-
" ſion, *The end of theſe things is deſtruction.*" *

Iſidore of *Peluſium*, who liv'd ſince *Baſil*, held, Muſic was allow'd the *Jews* by God, in a way of condeſcenſion to their childiſhneſs: " If God, *ſays he*, bore with bloody ſacrifices,
" becauſe of mens childiſhneſs at that time; why ſhould
" you wonder, he bore with the Muſic of an Harp and a
" Pſaltery?" †

Nay, there are ſome eccleſiaſtical officers in the Church of *England*, who, for their very profeſſion and employment, would have been kept from the communion of the Church, except they deſiſted from it. So we are inform'd by the *Apoſtolical Conſtitutions*: " If any come to the myſtery of
" godlineſs, being a player upon a Pipe, a Lute, or an
" Harp; let him leave it off, or be rejected." ‖

From what has been ſaid, it appears, no Mufical Inſtruments were uſed in the pure times of the Church. It became Antichriſtian, before they were receiv'd. *Bellarmine* himſelf does not deny, they were late brought into the Church. " The ſecond ceremony, *ſays he*, are the Muſical
" Inſtruments, which began to be uſed in the ſervice of the
" Church, in the time of Pope *Vitalian*, about the Year 660,
" as *Platina* relates out of the *Pontifical*; or, as *Aimonius*
" rather thinks, *lib.* iv. *De geſtis Francorum*, *c.* 114. after the
" year 820, in the time of *Lewis* the Pious." ‡

Dr. *N.* would hardly have denied, the Church of *Rome* was become Antichriſtian, when they were firſt brought in; even tho' we ſhould allow *Bellarmine*'s firſt date of them to be the true one. But a Reform'd Divine may well be aſham'd of that antiquity, that does not exceed the riſe of Antichriſt. But I am fully ſatisfy'd both *Bellarmine*'s dates are falſe, and that Inſtrumental Muſic, in the worſhip of God, is much later than either of thoſe accounts allow. For as to *Platina*, he ſeems to ſuſpect the truth of what he wrote: "*Vitalian*, *ſays he*, being careful about the worſhip
" of God, made an eccleſiaſtical rule, and order'd the
" Singing, with the addition (as ſome think) of Organs." *
Again, *Bellarmine*'s *Aimonius* is not the true *Aimonius*. For (as Dr. *Cave* ſays) *Aimonius* of *Fleury*, who wrote, *De geſtis Fran-*

---

* *page* 955. † Epiſt. *lib.* 2. *ep.* 176. ‖ *Lib.* viii. *c.* 32. ‡ De Miſſa, *lib.* ii. *c.* 15. Item, De bon. Oper. *lib.* i. *c.* 17. * In Vital.

Francorum, flouriſh'd about the Year 1000; and his Hiſtory, which begins at the deſtruction of *Troy*, is brought down as far as the coronation of King *Pipin*, or to the year 752. For what comes after that, and makes up the fifth Book, and the latter part of the fourth, is the continuation of another hand. *

Farther, that theſe Inſtruments were not uſed in God's worſhip, in *Thomas Aquinas*'s time, that is, about the year 1250, he himſelf is witneſs. "In the old Law, *ſays he*, "God was praiſed both with Muſical Inſtruments and human Voices, according to that *Pſalm* xxxiii. *Praiſe the* "*Lord with Harp, ſing unto him with the Pſaltery, and an Inſtru-*"*ment of ten ſtrings*. But the Church does not uſe Muſical "Inſtruments to praiſe God, leſt ſhe ſhould ſeem to judaize. Therefore, by a parity of reaſon, ſhe ſhould not "uſe Singing."† The like objection is made by our Author. But *Thomas* anſwers: "As to this objection, we muſt ſay, "as the Philoſopher, *Lib.* viii. *Polit.* that Pipes are not to "be uſed for teaching, nor any artificial Inſtruments, as the "Harp, or the like; but whatever will make the hearers "good men. For theſe Muſical Inſtruments rather delight "the mind, than form it to any good diſpoſition. But "under the Old Teſtament ſuch Inſtruments were uſed, "partly becauſe the People were harder and more carnal; "upon which account they were to be ſtir'd up by theſe "Inſtruments, as likewiſe by earthly promiſes; and partly "becauſe theſe bodily Inſtruments were typical of ſomething." Upon which place Cardinal *Cajetan* gives us this Comment: "'Tis to be obſerv'd, the Church did not "uſe Organs in *Thomas*'s time. Whence, even to this day, "the Church of *Rome* does not uſe them in the Pope's preſence. And truly it will appear, that Muſical Inſtruments "are not to be ſuffer'd in the eccleſiaſtical offices we meet "together to perform, for the ſake of receiving internal "inſtruction from God; and ſo much the rather are they "to be excluded, becauſe God's internal diſcipline exceeds "all human diſciplines, which rejected theſe kind of Inſtruments." ‖

If any one objects the practice of ſome Foreign Churches, I anſwer with Mr. *Hickman*: "They are laid aſide by moſt "of

* Hiſt. Liter. *p.* 597. † Secunda ſecundæ Queſtio 91, *art.* 4. & *concluſ.* 4.
‖ *Cit.* Hoffm. *Lex.* voce *Muſica*.

" of the Reform'd Churches: nor would they be retain'd " among the *Lutherans*, unleſs they had forſaken their own " *Luther*; who, by the confeſſion of *Eckard*, reckon'd *Or-* " *gans among the enſigns of Baal*. That they ſtill continue in " ſome of the *Dutch* Churches, is againſt the minds of the " Paſtors. For in the National Synod at *Middleburg*, in the " year 1581, and in the Synod of *Holland* and *Zealand*, in " the year 1594, it was reſolv'd, *That they would endeavour* " *to obtain of the magiſtrate the laying aſide of Organs, and the* " *ſinging with them in the Churches, even out of the time of wor-* " *ſhip, either before or after ſermons:* ſo far are thoſe Synods " from bearing with them in the worſhip itſelf." *

The Church of *England* herſelf had formerly no very good opinion of theſe Muſical Inſtruments; as may appear by her Homilies: " Laſtly, God's vengeance hath " been, and is daily provok'd, becauſe much wicked peo- " ple paſs nothing to reſort unto the Church; either for " that they are ſo ſore blinded, that they underſtand no- " thing of God or godlineſs, and care not with deviliſh " malice to offend their neighbours; or elſe for that they " ſee the Church altogether ſcour'd of ſuch gay gazing " ſights, as their groſs phantaſie was greatly delighted " with; becauſe they ſee the falſe religion abandon'd, and " the true reſtor'd, which ſeemeth an unſavory thing to " their unſavory taſt, as may appear by this that a woman " ſaid to her neighbour: Alas! goſſip, what ſhall we now " do at Church, ſince all the Saints are taken away; ſince " all the goodly ſights we were wont to have are gone; " ſince we cannot hear the like Piping, Singing, Chaunting, " and playing upon the Organs that we could before? But, " dearly beloved, we ought greatly to rejoice and give " God thanks, that our Churches are deliver'd out of all " thoſe things, which diſpleaſed God ſo ſore, and filthily " defil'd his holy houſe, and his place of prayer." †

A great number alſo of the Clergy in the firſt Convocation of Queen *Elizabeth* in 1562, earneſtly labour'd to have Organs, and that pompous theatrical way of ſinging laid aſide, and miſs'd the carrying it but by one vote, as I obſerve elſewhere. And in this Archbiſhop *Parker* concur'd with them, or at leaſt did not oppoſe them.

I will

* Apol. *p.* 139. † Hom. of the place and time of prayer, *part.* 2 *p.* 131.

I will add one or two teſtimonies of Papiſts againſt this Cathedral way of worſhip. The firſt ſhall be *Polydorus Virgilius*.

Having taken notice of *Auſtine*'s diſlike of that way of ſinging in his time, he thus proceeds: "But in our "time it ſeems much leſs uſeful to the commonwealth, "now our Singers make ſuch a noiſe in our Churches, that "nothing can be heard, beſide the ſound of the voice; "and they who come there (that is all that are in the city) "are ſatisfy'd with the Conſort of Muſic, which their ears "itch for, and never mind the ſenſe of the words. So "that we are come to that paſs, that in the opinion of the "common people, the whole affair of religious worſhip is "lodg'd in theſe Singers; altho', generally ſpeaking, there "is no ſort of men more looſe or wicked: and yet a good "part of the people run to Church, as to a theatre, to hear "them bawl: they hire and encourage them; and look "upon them alone as ornaments to the houſe of God. "Wherefore, without doubt, it would be for the intereſt "of religion, either to caſt theſe jackdaws out of the "Churches; or elſe to teach them when they ſing, they "ſhould do it rather in the manner of reading, than "bawling; as *Auſtine* ſays *Athanaſius* order'd, *&c.*" *

Next hear the judgment of *Eraſmus*: "Let a man be "more covetous than *Craſſus*, more foul-mouth'd than "*Zoilus*, he ſhall be reckon'd a pious man, if he ſings thoſe "prayers well, tho' he underſtands nothing of them. But "what, I beſeech you, muſt they think of Chriſt, who "can believe he is delighted with ſuch a noiſe of mens "voices? Not content with this, we have brought into "our Churches a certain operoſe and theatrical Muſic; "ſuch a confus'd diſorderly chattering of ſome words, as "I hardly think was ever heard in any of the *Grecian* "or *Roman* theatres. The Church rings with the noiſe of "Trumpets, Pipes and Dulcimers; and human Voices ſtrive "to bear their part with them. — Men run to Church "as to a theatre, to have their ears tickled. And for this "end Organ-makers are hired with great ſalaries, and a "company of boys, who waſt all their time in learning "theſe whining tones. Pray now compute how many "poor people in great extremity might be maintain'd "by the ſalaries of thoſe ſingers." †

Laſtly,

* De Invent. Rer. *lib.* vi. *c.* 2. *p.* 379. † In 1 Cor. xiv. 19.

Laſtly, *Lindanus* ſays: "Who will compare the Muſic "of this preſent age, with that which was formerly us'd? "Whatever is ſung now, ſignifies little for informing the "people; which 'tis certain the antients always de- "ſign'd."*

CHAP. IV.

Of the Public Liturgy.

BEfore I examine our Author's arguments, or rather his reproaches, I ſhall briefly, but plainly declare our opinion. We ſay then:

1. That a ſet Form of prayer is not in itſelf unlawful. We acknowledge our Saviour deliver'd ſuch an one, compos'd by himſelf, to his Diſciples, for them to uſe in prayer. Nay we adviſe ſuch weak people, as are not able to compoſe their own prayers, to make uſe of the Forms prepar'd by others.

2. That preſcrib'd Forms of prayer and Homilies are neceſſary, when there is not a ſufficient number of Paſtors, who can make their own Prayers or Sermons. We commend the prudence of our firſt Reformers in this reſpect, who, by compoſing Homilies and Forms of prayer, endeavour'd, as much as might be, to provide a help for the doleful ignorance of the Clergy.

3. That 'tis a very uſeful thing, Miniſters ſhould offer their Prayers to God, without being tied to a Form. For we know that ſuch is the temper of mens minds, that they leſs attend to the ſame thing, when often repeated. We own this is a fault; but yet 'tis a fault that cleaves ſo cloſe to us, that we cannot expect to be freed from it, as long as we are here in the world. Nevertheleſs we are to uſe our utmoſt endeavour, to engage and fix our minds in prayer; for which purpoſe, the not uſing a Form ſeems to us of ſingular advantage; and upon that account we would have Miniſters much uſed to this way of praying. And experience teaches us, this tends conſiderably to promote piety. For ſince he, who ſeldom employs himſelf in private Prayer,

* Panopl. *lib.* iv. *c.* 78.

Prayer, will be very unfit to pray without a Form in the assembly; Ministers will be in a manner necessitated to give themselves to religious exercises.

4. That no Form of prayer can be devis'd by men, that will fit all the various and sudden cases, that may happen; and that therefore conceiv'd Prayer should not be forbidden, even where the use of a Liturgy is prescrib'd. Many of the Episcoparians deny this; but Dr. *Nichols* here falls in with us.

5. That the Holy Spirit assists good men, not only by raising their desires, but by suggesting fit and proper matter for them. And we think they cannot deny the truth of this, who pray that *by God's holy inspiration* they *may think those things that be good.* *

6. 'Tis not clear to us, that the use of the *English* Liturgy is prescrib'd by any sufficient ecclesiastical authority; since the constitution of our *English* Synods has not any warrant, we can yet discover, either in the Holy Scriptures, or antiquity.

7. The *English* Liturgy seems to us confused and immethodical, abounding with many vain repetitions, and not the most fitted for public worship. We value and commend the Foreign Liturgies, as pious and useful, wherein God is addres's'd in a continued Prayer; but we can't approve our Liturgy, wherein the short prayers are divided between the Minister and the people; and many of their little Collects have often more of preface and conclusion, than petition in them. Wherefore, though the Presbyterians, for the sake of peace, would not refuse the use of a grave, well compos'd Form, with a reserve for the liberty of exercising their gifts; yet they think it very unreasonable to be tied to the use of the *English* Liturgy, according as it is at present.

8. Since the *English* Liturgy is so defective, and the Conformists will not suffer it to be mended; we say we are very unjustly blam'd, that we order our religious worship in a better manner, and more to the edification of the people. Many things are to be yielded for peace, but since our Adversaries have no regard to it; what should hinder our thorough reforming our worship, and suiting it to the greater profit of the Churches, without regarding their

* Collect for the 5th Sunday after Easter.

their fancies? But I proceed now to examine our Author's calumnies:

But how will they prove, that those sudden suggestions, which they pour out in their assemblies, are the dictates of the Spirit? For if we mind their indecent repetitions, and uncouth, flat and foolish expressions, they will be found so unworthy of the Holy Spirit, that any wise man would be very much asham'd of them. *

The Apostle bears witness, that the Holy Spirit assists Christians in prayer, *Rom.* viii. 26. They are therefore commanded *to pray in the Holy Ghost*, *Jude*, *ver.* 20. And our Saviour himself has assur'd us, that *his Father will give his Holy Spirit to them that ask him*, *Luke* xi. 13. Why then should we doubt of God's giving us that assistance of his Spirit he has promis'd, when we earnestly pray to him for it? Nor will impartial Judges much credit an Adversary's account of our religious service, who was perhaps never in his life present at it. They who have visited *Great Britain*, know, there are none more pious than our people in the whole nation. Since therefore honest pious men, who daily attend our Prayers, think otherwise of them, and find them very useful to improve them in godliness; we need not much trouble ourselves about the calumnies of spiteful men, who know nothing of the matter. And if the Spirit, as I said, not only inflames the desires of pious suppliants, but suggests also suitable matter for their requests; why should we refuse his help in either respect? And yet this they do, who tie themselves up to a Form. Our Author, if he would have done any thing to the purpose, should have prov'd, that God never gives his Spirit to Christians, and particularly to Ministers, for that end I have mention'd; or at least, that the Dissenters are men who cannot partake of that benefit.

Further, what our Author says here, seems not well to agree with the account he gives of us himself in another part of his Book: "Now, *says he*, their Discourses are "sober and correct; they study and compose them; "they have purg'd out the old musty obsolete words; "they take care not to be abrupt and incoherent." † If these things are true of our Sermons, who will believe we use *indecent repetitions, and uncouth, flat and foolish expressions* in our Prayers? But he goes on:

If

* *page* 259. † *page* 334.

If we consider the different phrase and method of their Prayers, some being Calviniſtical, *others* Arminian; *tho' we could think the Holy Spirit would descend to the singularities of these Theologists, yet we must not charge him with such contrarieties and clashings as they are guilty of.* Who, I pray, are those Arminians among us? Our Author perhaps here meant the Quakers, or some of the Anabaptists. But if we will speak the truth, the Arminians themselves are hardly Arminians, in offering up their prayers to God. But if there be any strength in this objection of our Author, the Conformists must necessarily quit all pretence to the Spirit's assisting any of them in prayer; for they offer the same prayers to God, which, some of them understand in a Calviniſt sense, others in an Arminian. Thus in the Burial office they *beseech* God, *that it may please* him, *of* his *gracious goodness, shortly to accomplish the number of* his *elect.* Now some of them hold, that none were elected by God from all eternity, who, when they hear this expression, imagine none else are meant by the elect, but good and holy men. Others presently, according to the Calviniſt scheme, think of some certain persons ordain'd to salvation by God's eternal decree. Why then may not another person, with a small variation of our Author's words, by the same argument say: *If we consider the different* sense they put upon *their own Prayers, some of them* taking them in a *Calviniſtical, and others in an Arminian* meaning; *tho' we could think the Holy Spirit would descend to the singularities of these Theologists, yet we must not charge him* [which were an impiety to be abhor'd] *with such contrarieties and clashings as they are guilty of*? And is not the Church of *England* in a fine condition, according to this argument? But let us hear what follows.

Some of these Devotioniſts [of which term of reproach I shall take no notice, because 'tis only the Translator's] *in the beginning of their Prayers can hardly speak; after much coughing and hemming, with much ado a few broken words drop out: a while after, their cold tongues seem as it were thaw'd, and move more glibly; and then presently you have a torrent of words, and they are in raptures. Now these motions are easily to be accounted for, by assigning them to the blood or spirits, which circulate in the body slower or swifter at different times. But what man in his wits can think, that the Holy Ghost should be at a stand for words, and want to be helped out by hems and coughs?*

This is exactly according to the manner, in which our Adversaries use to treat us. Nothing is so sacred with

them, but whenever 'tis to their purpoſe, they will turn it into ridicule. Muſt the Holy Ghoſt be thus abuſively treated; and if he aſſiſts men, who are pious, but yet imperfect, and perhaps under a bodily indiſpoſition, muſt he preſently be charg'd with all the defects and infirmities which they diſcover? But why may not this be an objection againſt his cauſe as well as ours? What Chriſtian would like to be preſent at thoſe prayers, in offering which, he could not expect the help of the Spirit? And yet a Conformiſt may have occaſion to *hem* or *cough*, as well as thoſe moſt comtemptible creatures, as they think, the Nonconformiſts. What the deſign of this kind of arguing is, I can't imagine, unleſs it be to deny that the Spirit helps any Chriſtians in prayer. We ought to judge charitably, and not upon ſlight evidence; and therefore 'tis not haſtily to be preſum'd of any one, that in his prayers he coughs on purpoſe, and without occaſion. But if any one, whether Conformiſt or Nonconformiſt, is chargeable with this, I ſhould ſay he was indeed guilty of a great error; but not that he was therefore certainly and utterly deſtitute of the Spirit's aſſiſtance. No man lives without faults, he is beſt who has leaſt.

But where's the hurt of a man's beginning with a low voice, and raiſing it by degrees? They who treat of the art of ſpeaking, dont uſe to condemn this. "In every "voice there is a *medium*, ſays *Craſſus*, and each voice has "its own peculiarly: hence 'tis both uſeful and ſweet to "raiſe the voice by degrees, for to ſpeak aloud at the be-"ginning is clowniſh." * To the ſame purpoſe *Quintilian*: "A ſoft pronunciation is commonly moſt proper at "the beginning." † Nor do I think the Apoſtle *Paul*, tho' he had the largeſt meaſure of the Spirit, abſtain'd from uſing any art in ſpeaking, with reſpect either to his voice, or geſture. ‖

Sudden conceptions are generally crude and confus'd, without any method or order: many things in them are obſcure and unintelligible, which, for haſte of uttering, the mind cannot digeſt. But now in our compos'd Offices every thing ſtands in its proper place. ‡

We grant the prayers in a Liturgy may be ſo diſpos'd; but we ſay too, that other Prayers without a Form may be expreſs'd

---

* Cicero de Or. *l.* iii. *c.* 61. *vid. l.* iii. ad Her. *c.* 12. † Inſtit. Orat. *lib.* xi. *c.* 3. ‖ *See* Acts xxvi. ‡ *pag.* 260.

expreſs'd diſtinctly, and in good order enough; provided a Miniſter is well vers'd in, and accuſtom'd to religious duties, and is not very unhappy in his elocution. Nay, he hardly ſeems qualified to diſcharge the ſacred Office, who is not able to compoſe both his own Prayers and Sermons. And whereas people are, when they join in ſuch prayers, uncertain what will come next, that is no prejudice to them, ſince by this means their minds are kept the more attentive to what they are about. And whatever our Author is pleas'd to ſay of *confuſion*, and want of method; I muſt needs ſay, our Prayers would very much diſpleaſe me, if the confuſion of them equall'd what I have obſerv'd in their compos'd Liturgy.

The people have nothing to ask of God, but what they may well weigh and conſider of at home: and if they meet with any thing which they dont well underſtand, they may have recourſe to the expoſitions of learned Divines, which are eaſily had. But extemporary Prayers leave men at a ſtand, whether they ſhould ſay Amen *to them, before they have conſider'd whether they contain nothing contrary to ſound faith, and Chriſtian virtue, nothing but what is fit to be pray'd for.*

In prayer no words are to be uſed, but what are plain and eaſie, which *leave* not *the people at any ſtand*, but are as ſoon underſtood as utter'd; ſo that they preſently know, without any difficulty, whether they ſhould aſſent to them, or not. Nor does God impute to any man thoſe Petitions, to which he does not aſſent. Further, if a man finds good reaſon to diſlike the Liturgy, which he has well weigh'd and conſider'd at home, our Author's objection then recoils upon himſelf. And as on one ſide, *the expoſitions of learned Divines are eaſily had*; ſo on the other, learned Divines themſelves may be without difficulty conſulted. And 'tis no ſmall inconvenience of our Liturgy at leaſt, that the things which, perhaps, were formerly proper enough, but upon an alteration of circumſtances are found to be otherwiſe, cannot be alter'd without a grievous offence. This will be plain by giving an Inſtance. Our Adverſaries, in King *James* the Second's time, were diſpleas'd both with his religion and deſigns; and thinking themſelves to be in great danger, they pray'd heartily for the ſucceſs of the Prince of *Orange* in private; but when they uſed the Liturgy in public, they pretended to pray that God would "ſtrengthen King *James*, that he might vanquiſh

" and overcome all his Enemies." * And so in the *Litany*, they used these words: " That it may please thee to keep " and strengthen, in the true worshiping of thee, in righ- " teousness and holiness of life, thy servant *James*, our most " gracious King, and governor. That it may please thee " to be his defender and keeper, giving him the victory " over all his enemies. "

Which no man can promise for them before hand, who remembers what prayers were made by the great masters of this art in our late troublesome times; how confus'd, how seditious, how blasphemous they many times were. †

We doubt not these things might be true of some Sectaries, and Heretical persons, who then invaded the sacred office. But what's that to us? Our Author should have shewn, that the Presbyterians were guilty of such things. 'Tis very unjust to blame us for those Actions of frantick men, which we detest. But if any thing may be infer'd from our Author's argument, by the same reason all sermons must be put down, and men be tied up intirely to the use of homilies. For, no doubt, they talk'd after one and the same rate, in their sermons and prayers. But I have had occasion to speak of this before.

But every pious person may fully and freely assent to our Common Prayers, because he can be acquainted with them before hand; and may be very hearty in his petitions, as being well assur'd that he asks nothing amiss.

But what if those Common Prayers, being known before hand, and read too with the explications of learned Divines, appear unfit for us to assent to, or to use? And such indeed they seem to us. But our Author does not meddle with that, which we look upon as the greatest inconvenience in Forms; namely, that mens wandering minds will very hardly attend to the same thing, repeated over a thousand times. Hence the Minister's tongue frequently outruns his thoughts; as has appear'd, when they have inadvertently pray'd for any of the Royal Family, who used to be nam'd in their prayers, after they were dead. Which might be proved by the testimony of such as have been present at the time.

In short, a Minister's unpremeditated prayers can hardly keep up the gravity of his assembly; many things dropping from him, which

---

* *Morn. and Even. Prayer.* † *pag.* 261.

which are trifling, and unbecoming a Divine; besides the loss he is sometimes at for matter, which forces him, rather than be quite mute, to vent very impertinent incoherent stuff, such as provokes the spleen of men, that are otherwise serious enough.

Thus 'tis the manner of some, *to speak evil of the things they know not.* * Our Author here shews, he knew nothing of our assemblies, where men dont use to *laugh and jest*, which is his expression, except such happen to drop in, as treat all serious things in that manner. But supposing Ministers drop'd a less proper expression, they ought not to be thought worthy of such treatment; especially since the prayers of the antients were not always the most exact, to say nothing worse of them. This is taken notice of by *Austin*, who, by a prudent advice, endeavour'd to prevent honest mens being laugh'd at upon that account. "When they, *says he*, come "to be made Christians, who excel others in the art of "speaking, we must inculcate upon them one thing, over "and above what we do upon other illiterate persons; "namely, we must diligently admonish them to be clothed "with Christian humility, that they may learn not to de- "spise those, who, they will see, more carefully avoid a "fault in their actions, than in their expressions; and may "not dare to compare an eloquent tongue with a pure "heart, tho' they have been used to give it the preference. "——Make them understand, that not the voice, but "the affections of the soul, reach God's ears: for then "they will not laugh, if they observe *any of the Bishops, and "Ministers of the Church, are guilty of barbarisms, or solecisms, "in their praying to God*; or dont understand, but blunder "in the words they pronounce." † Whence, by the way, 'tis plain Bishops and Ministers were not bound up, at that time, to the use of a set form of words in prayer.

If any extraordinary occasion happens, either for prayers or thanksgivings, the Bishops are impower'd by our laws to compose special Forms. ‖

We are glad this is done now and then; but experience tells us, there is good reason to complain of the long time such Forms are preparing. Thus, for instance, in the year 1703. we had a most terrible storm, that affrighted the whole nation: This happen'd on a *Saturday*, and the next Lord's day the Dissenting Ministers every where humbled

* Jude ver. 10. † De Catech. rudib. c. 9. *tom.* iv. *p.* 298. ‖ *pag.* 262.

themſelves before God, and bewailing their own and the nation's ſins, earneſtly beſought him to turn from the fierceneſs of his anger. But the Churchmen were forc'd to wait ſome time, till the Biſhops could meet together, and draw up a Form for this purpoſe, and get it printed and diſpers'd through the nation. This I mention'd in one of my Letters, that I might ſhew the uſefulneſs of Free Prayer; but I found ſome were ſo extremely fond of their Forms, that tho' they could not deny there was great reaſon for the whole nation earneſtly to ſeek God upon that account; yet they choſe rather to deny there was any neceſſity of their doing it, before the Biſhops had provided ſuitable Prayers, than they would let the honour of their Liturgy ſuffer in the leaſt.

Or if any thing unuſual happens in the circumſtances of private perſons; if it be any way fit to be mention'd in prayer; it may conveniently enough be brought in by the Miniſter, in his Prayer before Sermon.

Now I congratulate my ſelf, that thoſe *extempore* Prayers, which our Author has been hitherto bantering, are at length acknowledg'd to be at all uſeful. But 'tis well known, that many of the Church of *England* wiſh this liberty was entirely taken away. And among the reſt, this ſeems to be the ſenſe of thoſe, who had the care of this Tranſlation. For the Tranſlator has quite alter'd the Doctor's words, and has render'd them thus: *And as for the unuſual circumſtances of private perſons, they want not ſufficient helps and directions in ſuch caſes.* Now what are thoſe helps and directions, I pray, in ſuch caſes? 'Tis plain, by his thus quite altering the ſenſe, he is againſt a Miniſter's bringing thoſe caſes into his prayer before Sermon; and where elſe he can bring them in, I can't imagine. So that the true meaning of this dark and blind expreſſion muſt be, that he needs no help in thoſe caſes, being directed to let them alone. I ſuppoſe one reaſon of this alteration is, the earneſt endeavour of ſome men lately, to lay aſide the Miniſter's praying in the pulpit before ſermon; and the Tranſlator, being of the ſame mind, thought it improper to mention the Miniſter's inſerting any thing in that prayer, which he would not have him uſe.

I come, in the next place, to inquire, with our Author, into the antiquity of Liturgies. Now here we object, as he ſays, *That the primitive Church affords them no pattern of a Liturgy.* And to this he anſwers thus;

If

If they mean the Apoſtolic age, we freely own there were no Liturgies then, compos'd with ſuch accuracy and exactneſs, as they were afterwards.

There is little fairneſs in this paſſage. I wiſh our Author would plainly deny or affirm, there were Liturgies written in the *Apoſtolic age*. If he denies it, he muſt own the Diſſenters herein follow the example of the Apoſtles. If he affirms it, I deſire ſome good evidence of his aſſertion. He has to do with adverſaries not very credulous, who, when any thing is propos'd to them, as uſed in the Apoſtles time, and therefore fit to be imitated, inſiſt upon its being prov'd, by clear and undoubted teſtimonies, to have been then receiv'd. But what means this expreſſion: *There were no Liturgies then, compos'd with ſuch accuracy and exactneſs, as they were afterwards*? Does he think there were any Liturgies at all? By what miſchance were they loſt, or could they be loſt, ſince they would have been as continually read, and as carefully handed down to poſterity, as the Bible itſelf? And what neceſſity was there they ſhould, after the Apoſtles deceaſe, be compos'd with greater *accuracy and exactneſs*, than when they were alive? If there had been any Liturgies in their time, I ſhould fancy they would be far above the poliſhing of all after ages, as being compos'd, or at leaſt revis'd, by the Apoſtles themſelves. But our Author was of another mind. And hence our Adverſaries had rather appeal to the writers of the after ages of the Church, than to the Apoſtles. The order taken by the Apoſtles had not, forſooth, ſufficient accuracy and exactneſs, but was to receive that advantage from thoſe who came after them. Nevertheleſs, if they had ſet us ſuch an example, we ſhould much better like their plain and leſs accurate order; than the elaborate, perhaps, but too officious emendation of their ſucceſſors.

Nor was there any occaſion for ſuch helps in the Apoſtles days, when miracles were not ceaſed, and prayers were confeſſedly made by the inſpiration of the Holy Ghoſt.

The Apoſtles had a regard not only to their own, but to after times. If therefore they apprehended there would be afterwards *occaſion for ſuch helps*, we cannot doubt they would have made proviſion for the uſe and advantage of the Church. Beſides, does our Author think, that all thoſe, who were ever allow'd to pray in the Church, in the Apoſtles days, were endow'd with the *power of miracles*, or

with *inſpiration* ? * The Apoſtle ſeems to deny it. Why then might not thoſe, who had not theſe extraordinary gifts, want ſuch helps ? If they were not then neceſſary, why ſhould we think them ſo now ? That an ability to pray without them, may be attain'd by much exerciſe and ſtudy, is clearly prov'd by the moſt learned Bp. *Wilkins*, who wrote a Book on that ſubject. If then this gift of prayer may be acquir'd by uſe and ſtudy, 'tis not more neceſſary now to require all men indifferently to uſe a Liturgy, than it was in the Apoſtles time.

When this gift fail'd, Liturgies were drawn up more fully, as ours is; and many of the prayers of inſpir'd men were inſerted in them. But there was never any age of the Church, wherein there were not ſome Forms of prayer in the public worſhip.

If a Liturgy muſt be uſed, that, which has the prayers of inſpir'd perſons in it, is doubtleſs to be prefer'd to all others. Thus our Adverſaries uſe to cry up their Epiſcopacy, Diſcipline, Liturgy, and any thing elſe that belongs to them, as Apoſtolical. Our Author mentions elſewhere the commendation given the Liturgy by the Parliament : " That no one could doubt, the authors of that work were " aided by the inſpiration of the Holy Ghoſt. " † And indeed who can make any doubt of it, if what he here ſays be true ? For our Reformers muſt not be look'd upon as the authors of the Liturgy ; but thoſe *divine men, who pour'd out prayers in the Church, not without an inſpiration from heaven*, as 'tis in the *Latin* edition ; and from *whoſe mouths were taken*, if not all, yet ſome at leaſt, of the prayers, which are in their Liturgy. But who were thoſe divine men, from whoſe mouths theſe prayers were taken ? Who were the ſcribes ? Whom does he bring for witneſſes of the fact ? We, ſuch is our dulneſs, know not how to aſſent to theſe new conjectures. When what our Author aſſerts ſhall be ſolidly prov'd, I will vouch for our controverſy's being at an end. For we dont reject Forms compos'd by the inſpiration of the Holy Ghoſt ; but thoſe *Engliſh* ones, which, if we are not greatly miſtaken, ſmell of a very different compoſition. And why may we not now retort our Author's words upon himſelf ? " But how will they prove, that the prayers they " pour out in their aſſemblies, are the dictates of the Spi- " rit ? " ‖ Further, when our Author ſays, *There was never any*

* 1 Cor. xii. 28, 29, 30. † *See pag. 9. of the* Lat. *edit.* ‖ *pag.* 259.

any age of the Church, wherein there were not some Forms [the Translator adds, *of prayer*] *in the public worship.* We grant it, if he intended it of Forms for singing. We dispute not about them, nor about the Lord's Prayer. The question is, whether there were, in the first ages, any Forms of prayer of human composition, which the governors of the Church were oblig'd constantly to use?

The Jews, *whose plan of worship our Saviour follow'd in many things, used a public Liturgy in their Synagogues.* * And what then? Are Christians therefore bound to use a Liturgy? Whatever Christ has transfer'd from their worship into his own, we think we ought carefully to embrace. But since he has only deliver'd us one Form, what signify the *Jewish* forms to us? But this *public Liturgy* of the *Jews* was *compos'd by* Esdras, *and the great Synagogue, as learned men conjecture.* But we are not to be directed, in our worship, by *learned mens conjectures.* We shall soon make a fine business of it, if we are. And if those learned men were right in their conjecture, why is not their Liturgy reckon'd a part of Canonical Scripture? And whatever some learned men may think, there are others not inferior to them, who look upon this as a *Jewish* and old wife's fable, that deserves no credit at all.

In the first place, they solemnly confessed the sins of the people: then they gave thanks for God's mercies, in Hymns prescrib'd for that purpose: next they pray'd to God for their own, and the people's safety: and after all, the Master of the Synagogue dismiss'd them with a solemn benediction. Every body sees this was all Form and Liturgy. If this was all *Form and Liturgy*, our worship must be *all Form and Liturgy* also. The same things, tho' in a different order, are perform'd in our assemblies. Tho' I make no doubt of the *Jews* using a Liturgy, yet this does not prove they did so.

Nor was there any celebrated master among them, who did not teach his scholars some particular Form of prayer, whereby they might be known to belong to him. In compliance with this custom, our Lord taught his Disciples that which we call the Lord's Prayer. Since then we have one only master, even Christ, why should we not be content with that one Form of his composing, and not suffer our selves to be tied to the many Forms of other men? As to what the Doctor adds: *And*

* *page* 263.

And when he was on the croſs, he repeated a pſalm of David *as a Form of prayer:* we know, ſome men have ſo conjectur'd, but with no great probability. Nor do I ſee how it can be prov'd. But let us ſuppoſe it to be a thing certain: it will not thence follow, we are always bound to uſe the ſame Forms, drawn up by men, of their own heads. Far be it from us, to think our ſpotleſs Redeemer labour'd under the ſame malady with us miſerable creatures; that he was liable to the ſame infirmities we are, or that he needed ſuch a remedy as we do.

We have no diſpute about the uſing a Form in ſinging, as our Author could not but know. And therefore paſſing over *Pliny*'s teſtimony, who only ſpeaks of ſinging, I proceed to *Clement*.

What was Clement*'s preſcrib'd Canon of Liturgy*? * namely, *but a Form of prayer*? If Forms can be eſtabliſh'd by *Clement*'s authority, 'twill be paſt doubt, that they were uſed in the Apoſtle's time; for he was cotemporary with them, and, as all grant, wrote that Epiſtle not only before St. *John*'s death, but before ſome at leaſt, if not before any of his writings were publiſh'd. But he ſpeaks not a word of Forms of prayer. That the paſſage refer'd to by the Doctor may be the better underſtood, we muſt take notice, the quarrels in the Church of *Corinth*, and the ſedition rais'd againſt the Presbyters of that Church, gave occaſion to the writing that Epiſtle. Hence he gravely admoniſhes the *Corinthians*, to do all things orderly. "We ought, *ſays he*, "to do all things in order, which the Lord has commanded "us to perform." For this end he ſets before them the order of the *Jewiſh* Church: "To the chief Prieſt are given "his own (*Liturgies*, that is) offices; and to the Prieſts is "aſſign'd their proper place; the Levites have their pecu-"liar miniſtries; and the layman is bound by thoſe pre-"cepts, which concern the laity." † Then follows the paſſage, our Author had in his eye: "Let every one of "you, Brethren, give thanks to God in his own rank, "having a good conſcience, not tranſgreſſing the preſcrib'd "rule of his office;" that is, the place God has ſet him in. ‖ Now what has this to do with Forms of prayer? 'Twas no ſmall miſtake of our Author, to interpret that moſt antient writer, by the modern way of ſpeaking. For,

---

* *pag.* 264. † *cap.* 40. ‖ *Comp. Bp.* Hooper, of Lent, *p.* 303.

For, λειτουργία, neither in *Clement*'s time, nor in several ages after him, was used to signify a Form of prayer. Just thus the *Rhemists* pretend, those words of St. *Luke*, λειτουργούντων αὐτῶν, * should be render'd, *as they were saying mass*.

Or what else was the one Prayer in Ignatius? † Hear what *Ignatius* says: "Neither do you any thing without the "Bishop and the Presbyters. Neither endeavour to let "any thing appear rational to your selves apart. But "when you meet together in the same place, let there be "*one prayer*, *one supplication*, one mind, one hope, in love, "and joy unblameable." By the same argument our Author might prove, all the Dissenters use Forms: for whenever they also *meet together* in the same place, they have *one prayer*, *and one supplication*, in common to them all. For if the Minister leads in prayer, and all the congregation agrees in his desires, there is then certainly but one prayer, whether he prays with, or without a Form. Unless our Author had been in a great want of testimonies, he would not have endur'd to produce such frivolous ones, which are nothing at all to his purpose. Much of a sort with these are his two next testimonies, which I shall however briefly examine.

Or the common prayers in Justin Martyr? *We make*, says he, *common Prayers*. Thus the *English* Liturgy is call'd, *Common Prayer*. Whence our Author thought it past all doubt, that *Justin*, when he spoke of *common prayer*, must mean a prescrib'd Liturgy. But our prayers are not less common, though we use no Forms. But *Justin* presently after shews the reason why he calls these prayers *common*. "After "that, *says he*, we rise up all κοινῇ, *in common*, and offer "prayers to God." If *Justin*, or any other antient author, had mention'd their reading prayers, it would have been to the purpose; but prayers of any kind, cannot but be common to all those who join in them. Indeed, *Justin*'s expression of *making* prayers, might be much more plausibly alledg'd on our side, than his other of *common prayer* can be on theirs. Mr. *Erasmus Warren*, a writer of some note, in a Sermon, wherein he highly extols the *English* Liturgy, explains the Apostles expression, ποιεῖσθαι δεήσεις, *that prayers be made*, ‖ to mean the composing a Liturgy. If that were true, why should not *Justin*'s words be in the like manner under-

* Act. xiii. 2. † Ad Magn. sect. 7. ‖ 1 Tim. ii. 1.

understood concerning the compoſition of the Prayers? For no body will imagine the whole congregation made a Liturgy, and eſpecially that they did it every time they met. But I ſhall have occaſion to ſay more of *Juſtin* hereafter.

And the public prayer in Cyprian? Whoever reads the whole Paſſage in *Cyprian*, preſently ſees, how little this deſerves an anſwer. For *Cyprian* there comments upon the Lord's Prayer after this manner: "Above all, the "teacher of Peace, and maſter of truth, would not have "men pray, as in a ſingle or private capacity, that when "a man prays he ſhould only pray for himſelf. For we "dont ſay, *my* Father, which art in heaven; nor, give *me* "this day *my* daily bread; nor does every one pray to "have *his* own debts *only* forgiven; nor when a man asks "not to be led into Temptation, or to be deliver'd from "evil, does he ask theſe things for *himſelf alone*. We have "*a public and common prayer*; and when we pray, we "pray not for *one* perſon, but for *all the people*; becauſe "we, the whole people, are one." * Who does not ſee now, in what ſenſe *Cyprian* ſpeaks of *public and common prayer*? But let what he ſays elſewhere, be compar'd herewith: "Let every one pray to God, not for himſelf "alone, but for all the brethren; according as our Lord "has taught us to pray; where he does not preſcribe to "each perſon a private prayer, [that is, *a particular prayer* "*for himſelf*] but has commanded us, with *a common* "*prayer* and harmonious ſupplication, to pray for "all." †

Now the Doctor paſſes on to the compoſers of Liturgies: Gregory Thaumaturgus *is ſaid to have been the author of the Service us'd in the Church of* Neocæſarea, *from which they thought it not lawful to make the leaſt variation.* This is no where *ſaid of Gregory.* The Doctor thought *Baſil* affirm'd it, but he miſtook *Baſil*'s meaning. He is in the place cited by the Doctor diſputing againſt thoſe, who thought it unlawful, in pronouncing the doxology, to ſay, *with the Spirit.* ‖ He endeavours therefore, to ſhew from the writings of the antients, that ſuch a form of ſpeech was uſed in their time. And firſt, he alledges the Epiſtle of *Dionyſius* of *Alexandria*; then *Origen*'s Comment upon the *Pſalms*;

* De Orat. † Epiſt. xi. *p.* 26. ‖ De *Sp. S.* c. 29.

Psalms; and next, *Africanus* the Historian's *Epitome of times*. Thence he goes on to *Gregory Thaumaturgus*, and having spoken highly in his praise, he adds somewhat concerning the Churches of his country, which Dr. *N.* has thought to be to his purpose: "They have added to the "Church, neither deed, nor word, nor any mystical figure, "beside what he left them. Nay, many things, which "are done among them, seem defective by reason of the "antiquity of their constitution. For they who succeeded "in the government of the Churches, would not bear to "receive any addition of things found out after his time." And then he appeals to the receiv'd custom of that Church. But I shall make a few remarks upon this passage of *Basil*.

1. The temper of the fourth Century is plainly here discover'd; namely, that they were wonderfully delighted in inventing new rites; which, therefore, in a short time, were increas'd to a prodigious number. For *Basil* intimates, that a vast alteration was made in most Churches, since *Gregory*'s time.

2. 'Tis not probable *Gregory* compos'd any Prayer book, because *Basil* does not mention it. If any such book had been extant, how could it happen that when he cited *Origen* and *Africanus*'s writings, he should say nothing of this book of *Gregory*? By this means *Gregory*'s opinion might have been certainly known, and the controversy *Basil* had with the Clergy of *Neocæsarea* might have been soon ended. Nor is it to be thought, that *Basil* would rather appeal to the practice of the Church of *Neocæsarea*, for *Gregory*'s opinion, than to his own writing, if there had been any such.

3. *Basil* mentions no Form of prayer compos'd by *Gregory*, or any body else. And the same argument, by which our Adversaries would prove, that none but *Gregory*'s Prayers were used in the Church of *Neocæsarea*; will likewise prove, that nothing was read in that Church for Sermons, but only his Homilies. For *Basil*'s words may as well be understood of sermons, as prayers.

4. Let the learned consider, whether *Basil* does not elsewhere say, what is directly contrary to this. When the Clergy of *Neocæsarea* complain'd, that the singing by turns, which *Basil* us'd, was not practis'd in *Gregory*'s time; *Basil*, in his answer, asks them, how they could prove it? And then adds: *For you have not preserved any of his usages*

uſages to this day. * And this I mention, that I may ſhew, the latter part of that Treatiſe of *Baſil*, *De Spiritu Sancto*, is not without reaſon ſuſpected by learned men to be interpolated, if it be not ſpurious.

'Tis obſerv'd as a monſtrous thing in Paulus Samoſatenus, *That he chang'd the Hymns antiently receiv'd in the Church, for new ones of his own compoſing.* And well might his action be look'd upon as monſtrous; for inſtead of the Hymns which uſed to be ſung in honour of Chriſt, he hired ſorry women to ſing in the Church Hymns in praiſe of himſelf. And what is this to the Diſſenters? 'Tis true, this proves there were antiently Forms for ſinging. But, what need that be ſo induſtriouſly prov'd, of which no body doubts? But now, if not only Hymns, but Forms of prayer alſo had been uſed in the Church at that time, no one will queſtion, whether the doctrinal principles contain'd in both were the ſame. Wherefore if *Paulus*, being a vile Heretic, could not bear with the Hymns, for their contradicting his Heretical notions, and therefore chang'd them; certainly, for the ſame reaſon, he would not have retain'd the prayers. How comes it then to paſs, that the Synod, which ſo ſeverely cenſures him, for laying aſide the Hymns, ſhould ſay nothing at all of his crime in rejecting the Prayers? I can't therefore but ſtrongly conjecture, from this very place, that there was then no preſcrib'd Form of prayer in the Church. I cannot but add; that the monſtrous wickedneſs of *Paulus*, did only lie in the abominableneſs of the Hymns he brought in. For long after his time, it was reckon'd no crime, as particularly in *Ambroſe*, and others, to compoſe new Hymns for the uſe of the Church.

Conſtantine *the Great, did not only command his ſoldiers to uſe Forms of Prayer, but with a ſtrain of piety, ſeldom found in princes, he compos'd ſome for them.* Nor would the Diſſenters at all ſcruple to commend *Conſtantine* for what he did. For they themſelves uſed in their ſermons to adviſe, ſuch as cannot pray without, to make uſe of Forms. Whence ſeveral of our Miniſters have compos'd Forms for their aſſiſtance. We have, therefore, no controverſy with our Adverſaries, whether it be lawful to draw up Forms for the uſe of ignorant men, or pagan ſoldiers in ſecret. It

ſeems

* Epiſt. lxiii. *p.* 844.

ſeems to us quite another queſtion; whether one certain Form of words may be preſcrib'd to all the Paſtors of the Church, to be always uſed by them in prayer? Nor can *Conſtantine* be ſaid to have done this, in imitation of the Church's prayers; ſince, as he was not then baptiz'd, he could not have been ever preſent at them.

In Athanaſius, *we find ſome traces of an antient Liturgy, uſed at the celebration of the Sacrament.*

Athanaſius was accus'd, that he had curs'd the Emperor *Conſtantius*, when he was with his brother *Conſtans*. This calumny he refutes, and appeals to thoſe preſent, that being deſirous of the Emperor's welfare, he ſaid: *Let us pray for the ſafety of the Emperor* Conſtantius. But he ſays not a word of a Liturgy, or an aſſembly in the Church. Nay he ſeems to have ſpoken to a crowd, or a mob, ſtirring up the people to pray to God for the Emperor. Hereupon the people cry'd out: *O Chriſt, help* Conſtantius: juſt as they do with us: *God ſave the King.* And that *Athanaſius*, when he wrote this, did not dream of a Liturgy, but ſpoke only of the bawling acclamations of the mob, his next words ſhew: *And thus they continu'd praying*; that is, repeating that acclamation over and over, as is uſual on ſuch occaſions. And is not this a fine teſtimony for the uſe of Forms?

The other place of *Athanaſius*, cited from his Epiſtle, *Ad ſolitariam vitam agentes*, is not in the Epiſtle it ſelf, which is ſhort, and exceeds not two pages; but in an addition annex'd to it. *Athanaſius*, or who ever elſe was the author, there deſcribes the miſerable condition of the Churches, and the great grief which was caus'd by the edict of *Conſtantius*; and in a rhetorical manner he repreſents the complaints which they every where made to God, ſuch as the thing it ſelf ſeem'd to call for. For I can hardly think, he delivers the words of a Form. Nor is it probable the governors of the Churches could preſently meet together, and draw up ſuch a Form, that ſhould be uſed in all the Churches; and yet he ſpeaks of the Churches in general. Theſe are his words: "And ſuch was the wicked edict "*Conſtantius* publiſh'd. The people were ready for mar- "tyrdom, and the rather hated the moſt wicked Hereſy. "But there was mourning through the Churches, and "great groaning of thoſe that cry'd unto the Lord; *Spare* "*thy people, O Lord, and give not thine heritage for a re-* "*proach to thine enemies*; but make haſt to deliver us "out of the hand of the wicked: for behold they

"ſpare

" ſpare not thy ſervants; and prepare the way for Anti-
" chriſt."

Cyril *of* Jeruſalem *mentions the Prayer in the Liturgy, call'd* Surſum corda, *and the* Triſagion. * If it will do them any kindneſs, I can tell them of one much antienter than *Cyril*, even *Cyprian*, who mentions the *Surſum corda*. But who does not ſee, that is no prayer? " The Prieſt, *ſays he*, " prepares the minds of the Brethren, by uſing this pre-
" face before prayer: *Lift up your hearts:* that when the
" people anſwer: *We lift them up to the Lord*, they may be
" put in mind, they are to think of nothing elſe but the
" Lord." † And is ſuch a preface, wherein God is not addreſs'd, a Form of prayer? Thus our Miniſters ſometimes, before prayer, beſpeak the people: *Let us call upon God*; or, *Let us pray*; or the like; and yet we would not be therefore thought to uſe Forms. As for the *Triſagion*, we contend not about it, ſince it was an Hymn, as is plain from the thing it ſelf, and from *Cyril*'s words, who calls it ſo.

And in the Clementine *Conſtitutions, which were writ about this time, frequent notice is taken of Forms of prayer.* The time is very uncertain when thoſe Conſtitutions were written: and they have undergone ſo many alterations ſince, according to the different Cuſtoms of after times, as *Du Pin* acknowledges, that nothing can be gather'd from them. ‖

A Canon of the Council of Laodicea *orders, That the ſame prayers ſhall be us'd in morning and evening Service.* Our Author, in the Margin of his *Latin* edition, quoted two Canons of this Council, the ſeventh, which requires Heretics when they return to the Church to learn the Creeds; which is ſo foreign to the buſineſs of Forms of prayer, that the Tranſlator was in the right to take no notice of it. But the Doctor did not ſet down the number of the other Canon, and ſo the Tranſlator concluded the other number belong'd to this; tho', by looking into my Anſwer, he might have ſeen 'twas otherwiſe. 'Tis Canon xviii, and runs thus: " The ſame ſervice of prayers " muſt be perform'd at the ninth hour [that is, three a " clock in the afternoon] and in the evening." The Doctor here fell into his old miſtake. For the word λειτουργία does not here ſignify a Liturgy; but a duty, or miniſtry, or the like. And this Canon is therefore punctually com-

* *pag.* 265. † De Orat. Dom. *p.* 152. ‖ Nouv. Biblioth. *tom.* i. *p.* 31.

comply'd with, whether the same or different prayers are offer'd.

Nazianzen *speaks of antient Prayers of the Church used in his time.* I will set down the passage, in which he speaks thus concerning the Emperor *Julian.* "He saw our religion was "great, both for the Doctrines it contain'd, and the hea-"venly testimonies given to it; and that this was true "both of the Old Testament and the New: of the Old, "with respect to the predictions, and the notions of the "Deity, which shin'd forth, in some measure, therein; of "the New, upon the account of the last appearance of God, "and the amazing things caused by it, or accompanying "it. But he saw our religion was yet greater, and more "famous for those Ecclesiastical Forms, [Rules or Canons, "τύποις] deliver'd to us, and to this very day preserv'd by us. "That even this might not escape his mischievous hands, "what does he contrive, what does he do? He imitates "the *Assyrian Rabshakeh.* —— The same did this man think "to do, being ready to set up, in every city, schools, chan-"cels, and thrones, some higher, some lower; and to ap-"point lectures and explications upon the receiv'd notions "of the Gentiles, whether they related to the ordering mens "manners, or to abstruser matters; and also a Form, or "*Rule*, of prayers to be sung in parts, ἐυχῶν τε τύπον ἐν "μέρει, and of punishing offenders according to the degrees "of their offences, and of initiating and perfecting persons, "and such like things as plainly belong to our discipline." * Dr. *Bennet* thinks the ἐυχαὶ ἐν μέρει, cannot signify the alternate way of singing. I am of our Author's mind, who so understands that expression; altho' 'tis much at one to me, if Dr. *B*'s interpretation should be prefer'd. For if we understand *Nazianzen*, as Dr. *N.* does, concerning their way of singing, 'tis manifest then this testimony relates to Hymns, and not to Forms of prayer properly so call'd. But if we follow Dr. *B*'s version, and suppose he means Prayers said at different times, some in the presence of none but the Baptiz'd, others before any persons whatever; even then there will be no mention of Forms, except 'tis in that word τύπ⊙. Now that, I conceive, in *Nazianzen* signifies a *Rule*, rather than a *Form.* In which sense 'tis used by the Apostle: *Ye have obey'd from the heart that Form*, τύπον, *of doctrine, whereto*

* Orat. iii. p. 101.

ye were deliver'd. * Upon which place *Oecumenius* has this remark: τύπον δὲ φησι διδαχῆς, οἷον ὅσον κ) κανόνα, that is, the Apoſtle means, *the Rule or Canon of doctrine.* And thus the verb τυπᾶν is of the ſame ſignification with νομοθετεῖν, and is join'd with it, as ſynonymous, in the ſame Homily, by another writer. † And that τύπ@ muſt be thus underſtood in *Nazianzen*, is evident, becauſe he ſpeaks as well of a Form, that is, a Rule, of puniſhing offenders, as of prayer. And indeed the Emperor might borrow from the Chriſtians the alternate way of ſinging, or the dividing their prayers into parts, according to the ſtate of the auditors: but forms of prayer he could not learn of them, becauſe they were in uſe long before, among the Pagans. And I obſerve, Dr. *Bennet* himſelf, however he contends earneſtly that τύπ@ can ſignify nothing but a Form, yet chuſes to ſpeak as I do of one part of the τύπ@ mention'd by *Nazianzen.* "St. *Gregory Nazianzen* aſſures us, *ſays he*, that *Julian* "intended to copy after them, and to eſtabliſh *Rules* for the "puniſhment of Heathens, according to their demerit." ‖ And tho', I obſerve, ſome would make περίοδον to agree with εὐχῶν, ‡ yet in my mind the ſentence coming between ſhews, it is a force upon *Nazianzen*'s words; and therefore my rendering his words is in that reſpect better.

Next to *Nazianzen* comes *his friend Baſil*, from whom our Author quotes one or two paſſages. The firſt is in his Letter to the Clergy of *Neocæſarea*, where he brings them in as making this objection: *But theſe things* [this way of alternate ſinging] *were not practis'd in the Great* Gregory's *time.* And to this he anſwers in the next words: *Nor were thoſe ſupplications, which you now make.* This, as our Author underſtands it, is directly contrary to what he makes *Baſil* ſay in the preceding page. There he tells us: Gregory Thaumaturgus *is ſaid to have been the author of the Service uſed in the Church of* Neocæſarea, *from which they thought it not lawful to make the leaſt variation.* And for this he alledges the ſame *Baſil*'s authority. Now how can this be, if he drew up the Service, and they had alter'd it? But I dont think *Baſil* in theſe paſſages contradicts himſelf, whatever he does in others, if he is the true anthor of them. For he does not here ſpeak of the very words uſed in prayer, but of the manner of praying. He means, that there was a great

* Rom. vi. 17. † Vid. Homil. contra eos, qui die Paſch. jejunant, inter opera Chryſoſtomi. ‖ Brief Hiſt. *p.* 149. ‡ Vid. Not. in Nazianz. Invect. in Jul. edit. à Montagu, *p.* 66.

great difference between *Gregory*'s and their way of praying. For he pray'd with many tears, and a godly ſorrow; they without exerciſing any repentance: he was always in charity; they ſwelling with paſſion when they offer'd to God their ſupplications. Thus he explains himſelf: "I dont ſpeak "theſe things out of a deſire of accuſing you. I could wiſh "you ſpent your lives in weeping and continual repentance, "foraſmuch as we alſo do nothing elſe but pray for the for- "giveneſs of our ſins; only we dont endeavour to remove "the anger of our God, as you, with the words of men, but "with the oracles of the Holy Ghoſt." As tho' he had ſaid: I dont ſpeak out of any ill will; but have therefore only blamed you, as unlike to *Gregory*, that I might provoke you to follow his example in his tears and repentance. And if I could do that, we ſhould never fall under your cenſure, who in that very way ſeek the remiſſion of our ſins, uſing the *Pſalms* of *David* for that end.

The next place quoted from *Baſil* is this: "I know that "communion in prayers is very advantageous.*" And who makes any doubt of this? Our Author, ſure, thought there could be no communion in prayers, unleſs they were read out of a Liturgy. If ſo, how could there be communion in prayers *in the Apoſtles days, when there was no occaſion for ſuch helps, when Prayers were confeſſedly made by inſpiration of the Holy Ghoſt*? †

But our Author further ſays of *Baſil*, that he *made a compleat Liturgy for the uſe of his own Church*. Now this I ſee no reaſon to believe. For *Baſil*, and the other Biſhops of his time, induſtriouſly conceal'd the myſteries of the Chriſtian religion, and all the prayers relating to them, from all thoſe who were not admitted to them. "They, *ſays he, meaning* "*the Fathers*, were well inſtructed to preſerve the veneration "of the myſteries by ſilence. For how could it be proper, "publicly to proclaim in writing the doctrine of thoſe "things, which no unbaptiz'd perſon may ſo much as look "upon?‖ Many ſuch paſſages occur in the writers of that age; ſo that 'tis not probable, *Baſil* would commit ſuch things to writing. *Jerom* mentions not any ſuch work of *Baſil*'s; and tho', 'tis true, he does not ſpeak particularly of all his writings; yet had he ever publiſh'd ſuch a work, of ſo public uſe in the Church, 'tis not likely *Jerom* ſhould not come

* Epiſt. 392. † p. 262. ‖ De Spir. S. c. 27.

to the knowledge of it, or that if he did, he would say nothing of it. The chief Foundation of this opinion is, *Nazianzen*'s ascribing to him ἐυχῶν διατάξεις.* But we must observe, *Nazianzen* is not there professedly reckoning up the writings of *Basil*, but giving an oratorical account of his great care of the Church. † There is no necessity therefore of our supposing, he meant a particular writing compos'd by him; 'tis enough, if up and down in his works he gives rules concerning the right manner of praying; and many such are still to be met with there. Or else this may relate, perhaps, to the alternate way of singing, which *Basil* brought into his Church, and signify the orders he gave about it. I the rather incline to this, because of his joining herewith ἐυκοσμίαν τῦ βήμα]ος, *the handsome ordering the Chancel.* Upon the whole, I think 'tis not probable, any Liturgy was forg'd in the name of *Basil*, before the sixth Century. And so much for *Basil*, whose authority, I confess, is of little account with me, considering he liv'd so near the beginning of the Antichristian times.

Ambrose *hath much to this purpose, and is himself reputed the author of certain Forms.* He is so reputed, but falsly; whence neither *Du Pin*, nor Dr. *Cave*, mention any Liturgy among those works of his, which are lost. Dr. *Cave*'s words deserve the reader's observation. "There are not wanting, *says he*, "some who would persuade us, that the *Ambrosian* Missal "was first compos'd by St. *Barnabas*, the first Archbishop "(as they say) of *Milan*, and the founder of that Church; "that it was inlarg'd by St. *Mirocletes*; that at length it was "brought into its present form by St. *Ambrose*, from whom "also it took its name. But they offer us meer trifles, who "tell us such dreams as these; nor can they produce the "least testimony of what they say from the antients. The "first that, I know, expressly mentions it, is *Walafridus Strabo*, about the year 842; who tells us, *Lib. de Reb. Eccl.* "*c.* 12. that *Ambrose*, Bishop of *Milan*, settled the order of "the Mass, and other offices for his Church, and his neighbours the *Ligurians*." ‖ And truly our Author has no where alledg'd any authorities to less purpose, than what he pretends to bring from this writer. Of the five places he refers to, the first only is *Ambrose*'s writing, but relates not to our controversy. But I shall briefly go over them all.

The first is upon *Luc.* xv. and is wholly about the alternate

* Vid. Cave Hist. Lit. *p.* 194. † Orat. 20. ‖ Hist. Lit. *p.* 758.

nate singing. But what signifies that to prayers? Forms of hymns for singing, we all grant, are both lawful and useful. As to the alternate way of singing, *Ambrose* might well mention it; for he was the first person who brought the use of it into the Church of *Milan*.

All the rest of his testimonies are from works falsly father'd upon *Ambrose*; two of them, namely the first and last, belong to *Hilary* the Deacon, who is thought to be the author of that Commentary upon *Paul*'s Epistles. But that author in neither place says one word of Forms of prayer. He shews, upon 1 *Tim.* ii. 1. what they us'd to beg of God for Kings. And if that proves, they used Forms of prayer; the Dissenters may be prov'd to use them also, by the same argument, taken from the *Directory*, or their Addresses presented to our Princes. For therein we declare, what we desire in our prayers to God for them. In the latter place, *Rom.* xv. 30, 31. these are his words: "*Paul* begs he might be help'd "by their prayers, that he might be deliver'd out of the "hands of the unbelieving *Jews*; not because he was less "likely to prevail by his own prayers; but he has a regard "to due order, that the Church should pray for their gover-"nor." So that, if I understand the Doctor, he must have thought, there could be no praying without a Form; and that therefore, wheresoever the antients mention prayer, they must certainly speak of Forms.

The Treatise *De Sacram. lib.* iv. *c.* 4. speaks expressly of the Form of prayer in administring the Lord's Supper: and no wonder; for the author lived, undoubtedly, after Forms had crept into the Church. He sets down the very words of the Form, and no testimony more certain or express concerning any thing can be produc'd, than that is. And whoever will compare this testimony with those alledg'd before, will presently perceive a vast difference between them; whence 'tis easy to conjecture, the practice of the antients was very different in this respect from that of later ages. Why else should we not meet with as express and plain witnesses for Forms in the one, as the other? But neither *Ambrose*, nor any of his cotemporaries, was the author of these books. *Du Pin* acknowledges, they were not writ by him.* *Rivet* thinks, they appear'd not in the world till a little before *Paschasius Radbertus*, who first mentions them, about the year 840.†

* Nouv. Bibl. *tom.* ii. *p.* 290. † Crit. Sacr. *lib.* iii. *c.* 12.

Dr. *Cave* seems to approve of the opinion of Cardinal *Bona*, who was of much the same judgment with *Rivet* concerning them. * Bp. *Burnet* says, 'tis generally agreed, these books were writ some ages after *Ambrose*'s Death. †

The remaining Treatise cited by Dr. *Nichols*, as written by *Ambrose*, is that *De Dignitate Sacerdotali*. But this is not the true *Ambrose*, but *Gerbertus*, who was Pope *Sylvester* II. who died at the beginning of the eleventh Century. *Du Pin* acknowledges 'tis his; ‖ and *Mabillon* has, upon the credit of a MS. copy, publish'd it under his name, and with this title: *De Informatione Episcoporum*. Dr. *Cave*, in treating of *Ambrose*'s works, ascribes this to him; ‡ but afterwards he was sensible of his mistake, and own'd it might justly be doubted, whether it was a genuine treatise of *Ambrose*, or no; since it had nothing of *Ambrose*'s spirit and good sense: and he commends *Theophilus Raynaudus*, who judg'd it to be more like *Anselm*'s, than *Ambrose*'s writings. * And yet when he is treating of *Gerbertus*, he agrees with *Mabillon*, in attributing it to him. † And this was his last opinion, as appears by what he says in his second volume. ‖

But our Author says, *it would be endless to relate all that hath been said of Liturgies by* Chrysostom, Jerom, Austin, *and Writers of the following ages, down to the Reformation.*

Whatever our Adversaries can alledge, from those less pure ages of the Church, can by no means hurt our cause. For besides that many corruptions were then crept into the Church, we never yet condemn'd every kind of using Liturgies, as unlawful. The Doctor gives an account elsewhere of Mr. *Baxter*'s *composing* a Liturgy, which he and his Brethren *desired to have establish'd, in lieu of the Common Prayer Book*. ‡ But Mr. *Baxter* was for having many things left to Ministers discretion, and that they should not be oblig'd to use always just the same words; for he thought it sufficient, if, when they pray'd, they kept to the sense and design of what was express'd in the Form. This is is also practis'd in some Churches abroad, where the Ministers sometimes pray with, and sometimes without a Form, before or after sermon. But the great matter in dispute between us, if our Adversaries would but please to mind it, is, Whether Ministers, to whom God has given an ability of conceiving their own prayers, ought

* Hist. Lit. *p.* 214. † Expos. of the xxxix Art. *p.* 533. ‖ Annal. *tom.* ii. *p.* 218. ‡ Hist. Lit. *p.* 214. * In Addendis, *p.* 216. † Ibid. *p.* 594. ‖ *page* 79. ‡ *page* 76.

ought to be so tied up to a prescrib'd Form of words, as that they may never vary from it? This is what we chiefly deny; and our Adversaries will not easily be able to prove, there was any such order antiently in the Church, even after Forms began to be used in it. For what can be more certain, than that *Basil*, *Chrysostom*, and *Ambrose*, were not bound up to any particular Forms; if they compos'd themselves, as our Adversaries pretend, new Liturgies for the use of the Church? In the year 397, when Forms were in use, every Minister was allow'd by the third Council of *Carthage*, to chuse, or compose, his own Form; upon this one condition only, that he should first confer with his more understanding Brethren. * Now tho' we pretend not to pay much deference to the customs of that age; yet if our Adversaries went no farther than this, we should not oppose them. No Council then, or Emperor, prescrib'd the same Form of prayers to all the Ministers in a province. *Chrysostom* indeed, in the Homilies cited by our Author, gives an account of the method of their prayers; and largely relates how they prayed for the Catechumens, and what instructions they gave them before prayer. And if he used a Form, which may seem not unlikely, it signifies nothing to us, who never refus'd the use of a well compos'd Form; altho' when the Church is bless'd with able Ministers, we think free prayer is to be much prefer'd to it.

Next follows *Jerom*, who, according to our Author, *speaks of saying the Psalms alternately*, *Ad Rust. Ep.* 4: 'Tis not strange if he should speak of this, which all acknowledge was used by *Basil* and *Ambrose*. *In Epit. Stab. mentions the Trisagion*: What Treatise this is of *Jerom*'s, I am not able to guess; nor does the Translator help me. I thought, perhaps, there might be a mistake of the Printers, and that he meant *Epitaphium Fabiolæ*; but I was out in my guess. But whatever treatise he cites, the *Trisagion* belongs to the Hymns, not to the Prayers. *Comm. in Psalm.* xxxviii. *has those Liturgic phrases: Spare us good Lord. Remember not our offences, nor the offences of our forefathers*, &c. Those Commentaries are not *Jerom*'s, as *Du Pin* and Dr. *Cave* both acknowledge. Besides, there is no such thing in the place refer'd to. *In Lib. adv. Lucif. he commends* Hilary *for making a Liturgy, and a book of Hymns*. But why should he commend him for it, if there

* Can. 23.

was a Liturgy made before. None of the Episcopal party now commend Mr. *Baxter* for writing a Liturgy, different from that which they used long before his writing. But I would fain see *Jerom*'s own words, for I find no such passage in the treatise here cited.

And now *Austin* brings up the rear; and we are told, he speaks of *Liturgic Forms used throughout the Church*. *Ad Jan. Ep.* cxviii. & *De Eccl. Dogm.* He speaks largely of several customs, in his Letter to *Januarius*; but there is not a word in it of Liturgic Forms. The other book, *De Dogmatibus Ecclesiasticis*, was not writ by *Austin*, as all men own, and as the editors in my edition acknowledge. The first part of it is the work of *Gennadius Massilienses*, *viz.* as far as *chap.* xxi. The rest is of some later author; particularly *chap.* xxx. cited by our Author, is attributed to *Celestine*, and is to be met with among the Additions, at the end of his epistle. * For *Celestine*'s Letter consists only of the first Chapters; and the other part is the addition of a later hand; and the tenth Chapter of it is the thirtieth of the Treatise, *De Dogm. Eccl.* Besides, whoever was the author, there is no mention of Liturgic Forms in that Chapter.

Austin is said to speak of *Prayers, which the Church ever had, and will have*, *De Dono Persev.* *Austin* there only speaks of the matter of their public Prayers, and not of any Form of prayer. Some were afraid lest the doctrine of Perseverance should throw men into despair. In answer to such, he says: "But I wish they who are slow of heart, or "weak, who cannot, at least as yet cannot, understand the "Scriptures, or the explication given of them, would so, "or not at all, hear our disputes upon this question, as rather to mind the prayers, which the Church has always "had from its very beginning, and will always have to the "end of the world." † But if he were speaking of *Forms*, who can think he could have dreamt, that the same Forms were then used in the Church, which were used from the very beginning of it? But hear how he goes on more fully to explain himself: "For as to this matter, which we are "now forc'd not only to speak of, but to defend and vindicate, against Heretics newly sprung up, the Church "was *never silent* about it *in her Prayers*; altho' sometimes "she

* Vid Epist. Celest. pro Augustino, inter opera August. Par. 1635. *tom.* vii. *p.* 612. 613. † C. xxiii.

" she did not think it necessary to publish it in her Ser-
" mons, when she was not urg'd to it by any adversary.
" *For when was it that prayers were not made in the Church for*
" *infidels and enemies, that they might believe? When had any*
" *Christian a friend, a neighbour, or a wife that was an infidel,*
" *and did not pray that God would give him a mind obedient to*
" *the Christian faith? Or who ever did not pray for himself,*
" *that he might persevere in the Lord!* Or whoever heard a
" Priest making request to God for the faithful, and would
" venture to find fault with him, not in words, but his
" very thoughts, *if he happen'd to express himself thus; Grant*
" *him, O Lord, to persevere in thee to the end.*" Concerning the expression of *Common prayer*, and the *Sursum Corda*, I shall say nothing here, having had occasion to speak of them already.

Next he proceeds to the Reformers, *Luther*, *Calvin* and *Knox*, who, he observes, all compos'd Liturgies for their followers; but their Liturgies are contemn'd and despis'd by him. He might have added Mr. *Baxter* also to their number, of whose work he speaks with the like contempt. But the truth is, our quarrel is not so much about a Liturgy in general, as about that of the Church of *England*.

He adds, *And I dont know of one Church in the whole Reformation, but what approves of Forms, and owns them to conduce much to true devotion, it being the sole property (or honour, if they please) of our Nonconformists to despise and reject them.* *

But how does it appear, that *we despise Forms of prayer*? What have we ever said that was disrespectful of the Forms used by the Calvinists? Have we express'd any such contempt of them, as I have taken notice our Author does? All that our Adversaries can pretend to blame us for, is, that we treat their Liturgy just as they do their Neighbours. 'Tis true, we think free prayer, if well manag'd, tends most to the edification of the Church; but it does not thence follow, that we despise all Forms. Further, it cannot but seem strange to me, our Author should *not know of one Church in the whole Reformation, but what approves and uses Forms*. One would think, a person, so well acquainted with the state of all the Churches beyond the seas, should not be utterly without any knowledge of one so near as *North Britain*. For who does not know, that they neither are *fond of*

* *page* 206.

of them, nor use them? This ignorance must therefore be only pretended, unless he did not judge the Church of *Scotland* to be a true and Reform'd Church. But now if we will own the truth, sincere piety is no where found to flourish more, than in that same Church of *Scotland*, which has laid aside all Forms. Compare with them those who are so fond of our *English* Liturgy, I am asham'd to say, how great the difference is. Whence Dr. *Edwards* did not stick to reckon this among the advantages of the late Union: "That we shall be encourag'd not only to strictness of "discipline, but of life, by the example of our Bre-"thren, with whom we are now united." *

As for that invidious cavil at our Liturgy, that it was compil'd out of Popish books; I answer in short: That our Reformers took nothing from such books, but what was taken from the oldest writers.

Tho' it were easie to shew by many instances, that our Author here speaks unadvisedly, and contrary to the truth; I will, for brevity sake, only mention one thing, which I think is destitute of the authority of any good antiquity. The prayers in the *English* Liturgy, particularly in the Litany, are divided, so as to be said partly by the Minister, and partly by the people. This was never done antiently that I can find. I dont speak now of such interlocutions, as, *Lift up your hearts*, *We lift them up to the Lord*, mention'd by *Cyprian*; or mutual salutations, as, *The Lord be with thee*, *and with thy spirit*, used in *Chrysostom*'s time; but of that breaking of Prayers, properly so called, into parts, which is used in the Church of *England*; but would be in vain sought for in the antient Ecclesiastical writers.

We have many things out of the Greek *Liturgies of* Basil *and* Chrysostom; *more out of the Litanies of* Ambrose *and* Gregory.

All these Liturgies are spurious, or at least corrupted. Of those pretended to be compos'd by *Basil* and *Ambrose*, I have had occasion to take particular notice already. I shall here say somewhat of the other two briefly. Both *Du Pin* and Dr. *Cave* agree, the Liturgy that passes under *Chrysostom*'s name is not his, at least in the present state of it. They think it was at first compos'd for the use of the Church of *Constantinople*; but has been variously interpolated

* Sermon on the Union, *p.* 20.

lated ſince, according to the cuſtoms and uſages of various Ages. * And if this be true, how can they tell what they have out of *Chryſoſtom*'s Liturgy? *Du Pin* gives the like judgment of *Gregory*'s Liturgy, that 'tis not now as it came out of his hands, that many things are ſince added, and what is his cannot be diſtinguiſh'd from what is not. But if it were exactly as he wrote it, it would be a copy unworthy of the imitation of Proteſtants; as may appear by his other works, which dont want for ſuperſtition. †

Very much out of the antient Forms of the Church, diſpers'd in the works of the primitive Fathers, who writ long enough before the Roman *Breviary, or Canon of the Maſs were thought on.* I grant, many things are put into the *Roman* Liturgies, which are borrow'd from the fifth and following Centuries, when abundance of ſuperſtition had crept into the Church: but tho' the Books themſelves, in their preſent form, are of a later date; yet the matter of them may be trac'd much higher.

In ſhort, our Liturgy preſerves all thoſe antient Forms pure and uncorrupt; whilſt that of the Roman *Church hath mingled much error and ſuperſtition with them.* This cannot be true, ſince many Ceremonies of the antient Church are rejected, which, without doubt, had their particular Forms belonging to them; if all their Service was, as our Adverſaries pretend, perform'd by a Liturgy. The Church of *England*'s Liturgy has nothing of the antient Chriſm, of the mixture of milk and honey mention'd by *Tertullian*, as given to perſons preſently after Baptiſm, of the white Garments ſuch perſons uſed to put on. Where ſhall we find in the *Engliſh* Liturgy ſuch prayers as they join'd with their oblations for the dead? Where are their prayers for the *Angel of peace*, for *the deferring the end of the world*, and many other ſuch things which the antients ſpeak of? And altho' we acknowledge the *Roman* Liturgies abound more with ſuperſtition than the more antient ones, and than that of the Church of *England*; yet we dont think theſe were wholly free from ſuperſtition, as I have obſerv'd elſewhere.

Now, who will believe Forms of prayer were in the three firſt and beſt ages of the Church injoin'd, or ſo much as us'd; when our Adverſaries, who have made ſo dili-

* See Du Pin Nouv. Bibl. *tom.* iii. *p.* 38. Cave H. L. *p.* 258.
† Nouv. Bibl. *tom.* v. *p.* 143.

diligent and narrow a ſearch, are not able to produce any thing from the writers of that time, that carries in it ſo much as a plauſible appearance of evidence and proof? 'Tis in vain to ſearch in that time for Forms, or the compoſers of them; nothing can be alledg'd from thence concerning Liturgies, concerning written prayers, or the reading of prayers in the Church: nay, we have many conſiderable teſtimonies of the antients to the contrary.

And let us hear in the firſt place *Hermas*, a moſt antient writer: "When, *ſays he*, a man, who has the ſpirit of "God, comes into the Church of juſt men, who have the "faith of God, and prayer is made to God, then the Ho-"ly Meſſenger [or Angel] of the divinity fills him with the "Holy Spirit, and he ſpeaks in the Congregation as God "would have him." * Who that Meſſenger is, I confeſs, I know not, unleſs he means Chriſt.

Juſtin Martyr gives this account of their manner of praying in the Church in his time: "He that is Preſident "offers prayers and thankſgivings according as he is able, "ὅση δύναμις αὐτῷ." † Our Adverſaries think he meant only the ardency of his deſires; but that does not ſeem probable: for then the expreſſion would as well ſuit the people as the Miniſter; nor would he have ſo confin'd it, as he has done, to him. But let us compare this place with another, where he ſpeaks of himſelf and his Apology, and uſes the ſame expreſſion. "Having therefore exhorted "you according as we are able, ὅση δύναμις περ[illegible]ἀμενοι "ὑμᾶς, both by reaſon, and by a viſible ſign or figure, we "ſhall be henceforth blameleſs, if you do not believe." ‖ Since then the expreſſion there manifeſtly relates to the conſtruction of his Apology, why ſhould it not in the other place as well refer to the compoſing of their Prayers? But our Adverſaries alledge another place, where *Juſtin* uſes, they ſay, the ſame expreſſion concerning not the Miniſter, but the Peoples praying. But that cannot ſeem ſtrange, ſince *Juſtin* there ſpeaks of the prayers Chriſtians offer'd privately at home. I will tranſlate the whole paſſage, that his meaning may the more clearly appear. "That we are not "Atheiſts, who worſhip the maker of the univerſe; who, "we ſay (as we are taught) needs not blood, or ſacrifice, "or

* Paſt. *lib.* II. *mand.* 12. *ſect.* 1. † Apol. II. *in fine. p.* 162.
‖ Ibid. *p.* 157.

" or the burning of incenſe; whom we praiſe as we are " able, ὅση δύναμις αὐτοῖς, with prayers and thankſgi- " ving, for all the good things we live upon, ἐφ' οἷς προσφε- " ρόμεθα πάσιν: having receiv'd it by tradition, that the " only honour worthy of him is, not to conſume in the fire " what he has made for our food, but to beſtow it upon our- " ſelves, and ſuch as need it; and to be thankful to him, ex- " preſſing in words our ſolemn praiſes for our birth, and all " the means of health; for the ſeveral qualities of things, " and the viciſſitude of ſeaſons; and to ask of him that " we may obtain immortality thro' faith in him: that " we, I ſay, are not Atheiſts, what man who is in his " ſenſes will not acknowledge?" * *Juſtin* ſpeaks not a word here of a Chriſtian aſſembly, but only of the uſe they made of thoſe things which the Gentiles offer'd in ſacrifice. *Perionius* indeed in his verſion has render'd, ἐφ' οἷς προσφερόμεθα πᾶσιν, *in iis omnibus quæ offerimus*; but that is only to ſerve his Popiſh cauſe; for the ſenſe plainly carries it as I have render'd it, *for all the good things we live upon, we uſe, or eat*; and in like manner has he elſewhere render'd it himſelf. Ἐπὶ πᾶσι τοῖς προσφερόμεθα εὐλογοῦμεν τὸν ποιητὴν τῶν πάντων: *in omnibus quibus utimur.* † It is no great wonder Papiſts catch at any thing in the writings of the antients, that looks like the mention of oblations; but in my mind Proteſtant writers ſhould not herein imitate them. And with as little reaſon, by the way, do they ſtrain another expreſſion, in that Apology, to the ſame purpoſe: Ἀρῶ προσφέρομαι, ᾗ ὅιν. For *Juſtin* does not there ſpeak of their being offer'd to God, but to the Miniſter; and therefore a little before, he expreſs'd himſelf more fully: Ἔπειτα προσφέρομαι τῷ προεστῶτι τῶν ἀδελφῶν ἄρτος. So that upon the whole, I think all things concur to ſhew we rightly interpret *Juſtin*'s meaning.

Origen ſpeaks of their praying in like manner: " We " worſhip, *ſays he*, one God, and his one Son, who is his " word and image, with ſupplications and honours, *accord-* " *ing to our ability*, offering to the God of the univerſe " prayers and praiſes thro' his only begotten Son." ‖ And again: " But the *Grecian* Chriſtians in *Greek*, the *Romans* in " *Latin*, and every one in his own proper language, prays " to God, and praiſes him as he is able." ‡

Tertullian

* Ibid. *p.* 139. † *p.* 162. ‖ Contr. Celſum, *lib.* viii. *p.* 386. ‡ *p.* 402.

Tertullian is our next witneſs, who gives us this deſcription of Chriſtians in their prayers: "We Chriſtians pray "for all Emperors, *&c.* looking up to heaven with our "hands expanded, becauſe guiltleſs; with our head un-"cover'd, becauſe we are not aſham'd; *denique, ſine moni-"tore, quia de pectore; laſtly, without a monitor, becauſe our "prayers flow from our own minds.*" * The Churchmen, in their diſputes with us, frequently reckon it among the advantages of their Liturgy, that the eyes being fix'd upon the Common Prayer Book, are kept from wandring. But how contrary is this to the cuſtom of the antient Chriſtians, who, following the example of our Saviour, look'd up to heaven when they pray'd? But the queſtion is, What *Tertullian* means by thoſe words, *ſine monitore, quia de pectore*? We think he meant, that Chriſtians prayers were not read out of a book, becauſe their own *breaſt*, that is their own *minds* ſuggeſted them. Our Adverſaries reject our interpretation, and ſay, this *de pectore* is all one as *memoriter, by heart.* Let our Arbitrators now judge whoſe interpretation is beſt. For if Chriſtians uſed then to ſay their prayers by heart, and if their prayers were very long (as they actually were) there was great need of a *monitor*, or, as † *Pliny* calls him, a *cuſtos*, that ſhould attend and be ready to prompt them; ſince no man can be ſecure his memory ſhall never fail him. But how indecent would it be, if the Miniſter, who leads the congregation in prayer, ſhould ſtand mute thro' the failure of his memory? And a *monitor* ſignifies properly one, who helps a perſon when he is at a loſs, and ſuggeſts to him what he is to ſay. Whence perſons, whoſe buſineſs this was on the ſtage, or in courts of judicature, were call'd *monitors.* Hence *Cicero* ſpake in that manner: "I dont mind what you will ſay; for I ſee "'tis not you who are to anſwer me, but that book which "your *monitor* has in his hand." ‖ In the ſame ſenſe *Pliny* uſes the word in complementing *Trajan*: "It was very "pleaſing, that you call'd the Knights by their names "without a *monitor.*" ‡ Further, the maſter of the exerciſes among the *Romans* was call'd a *monitor*; and from thence ſome would explain *Tertullian*'s words, but they are miſtaken; for the Miniſter who officiated, without doubt, was, in this ſenſe, the *monitor* to the congregation. And therefore

* Apol. c. 30. † H. N. *lib.* xxviii. c. 11. ‖ De Divinat in Verr. ‡ Paneg. c. 23.

therefore *Tertullian* could not have said they pray'd without such a *monitor*. But if our interpretation be receiv'd, nothing could be spoken more pertinently. For 'tis all one as if he had said: "There is no occasion for a *monitor* "with us, who should prompt the Minister when he prays; "for his prayers are not learnt from a book, but flow from "the pious and vehement desires of his heart."

But 'tis objected: That *pectus* signifies the *memory*, but is never used in that sense we take it in.* But it seems very wonderful to me, that learned men will venture to deny what every one, who has at all convers'd with *Latin* authors, must needs have observ'd. 'Tis well known, the antient Fathers of the Church did all in a manner agree with the *Peripatetics* and *Stoics*, in making the heart or *breast* the seat of the soul. † And there have been many among the more modern Philosophers and Divines, who have embrac'd the same opinion. Hence *pectus* is used figuratively for the soul, or for any faculty of the soul, not only by ecclesiastical, but by all other authors, either in prose or verse. Nothing more common in *Latin* authors, than *pectus apertum, fidum, amicum*; and *avidum, sordidum*, &c. 'Twould be endless to reckon up all the places where *pectus* is thus us'd by antient authors. I might mention several; but if the reader understands only *English*, they would signify little to him; and if he understands *Latin*, I refer him to the *Latin* edition, ‖ where he will find enough to this purpose.

There is another place of *Tertullian*, from which, one may reasonably conjecture, no other Form, besides the Lord's Prayer, was then prescrib'd. For he seems to have been of this opinion, that tho' it were lawful to use other prayers after the Lord's Prayer; yet the right of prescribing Forms belong'd to God only. "God alone, "*says he*, can teach us how he would be pray'd to. "The Duty therefore of prayer, which was order'd "by him and his Spirit, even then when it came out "of our Lord's mouth, being embolden'd by this privilege, "ascends into heaven, commending to the Father, what "his own Son has taught. Yet since our Lord, who fore-"saw men's necessities; after he had deliver'd the Rule "of

* See Bennet. Br. Hist. *p.* 99. Epist. ad Fabiol *tom.* iii *p.* 38.

† See Tertull. de Anima, *c.* xv. Hieron. *p.* 306; &c.

" of prayer, said particularly, *ask, and you shall receive*; " and there are several things which need to be ask'd, " according to every one's circumstances, the *rightful and* " *ordinary prayer* [the Lord's Prayer] being first us'd, as " a foundation, we may lawfully add other desires, " and build other petitions upon it; only we must remem- " ber his precepts, lest we as much fall short of being " heard by him, as we do of obeying his precepts." * So that they us'd to pray *de pectore*, that is, from their heart. Which is what God hears, as the same author tells us in another place: " God hears not the voice, " but the heart, which he also looks into." † And I must own, there seems little weight with me, in the objection made against this interpretation: That it signify'd nothing to the Emperor, whether they pray'd with, or without a Form; and that therefore, it was not likely, *Tertullian* would trouble him with any account of it. For it signify'd as little to him, whether they pray'd with their hands expanded, or their heads cover'd, or not. And since notwithstanding that, he relates their custom in the one, I see not any reason, why he might not as well in the other. I will now add a testimony or two of the fourth Century.

Basil us'd free prayer, without a Form, as he witnesses of himself: " When I was lately praying with the " people, and concluded with the Doxology two several " ways; sometimes to God the Father, *with* his Son, and " *with* the Holy Ghost; sometimes, to God the Father, " *through* his Son, *by* the Holy Ghost: some that " were present reprov'd me; saying I us'd not only strange, " but inconsistent expressions." ‖ Another instance like this may be seen in *Theodorit*, H. E. *lib.* 11. *c.* 24; and *Philostorgius*, *lib.* iii. *c.* 13. From what *Basil* says, it appears there was no certain form of words prescrib'd for their Doxologies; and yet one would think if any part of their prayers were tied to a set form of words, it should have been that which was used in their hymns as well as prayers, and used to be often repeated, especially in the *Greek* Churches; whence some have thought the Doxology, at the end of the Lord's Prayer, was not added by Christ himself, but crept into *St. Matthew*'s Gospel, from the custom

* De Orat. c. ix. † Ibid. c. 13. ‖ De Sp. S. *c.* 1. *infin.*

cuſtom of the *Greeks*. In like manner *Ambroſe* thought not himſelf tied to a ſet of words; but took notice in his prayer, of a caſe that happen'd ſuddenly, while he was adminiſtring the Lord's Supper. "While, *ſays he*, I was "offering, I underſtood one *Caſtulus*, whom the *Arians* call'd "a Presbyter, was ſeiz'd by the People. They had met "with him as they were going along in the ſtreet. I be-"gan to weep moſt bitterly, and, in the very oblation, to "beſeech God, that he would help, and that this man's "blood might not be ſhed in the Church's cauſe; and "truly that my blood might be ſhed, not only for the ſafety "of the people, but for the wicked themſelves." * 'Tis objected this was a private prayer; but *Ambroſe*'s words will not admit of that, who ſays it was, *in ipſa oblatione*, in the very oblation.

Laſtly, That I may paſs over many things, which the learned Mr. *Clarkſon* has collected upon this head, I will cloſe this Chapter with the teſtimony of *Epiphanius*, who writes thus in his Letter to *John* the Biſhop of *Jeruſalem*: "I could not alſo but wonder, when I heard that ſome, "who uſe to carry reports backward and forward, adding "always ſomewhat of their own, in order to ſtir up grief "and ſtrife among Brethren, have diſturb'd you, and ſaid, "that when we pray at the Lord's Supper, we uſe to ſay "thus upon your account: *Lord grant* John *may believe* "*aright*. Dont think us ſo clowniſh as to be able to ſpeak "this out ſo openly and plainly. Altho' I always pray "thus in my heart, yet I never expreſs'd it in the hearing "of the people, leſt I ſhould ſeem lightly to eſteem thee, "my beloved. But when we are toward the end of our "prayer, according to the manner uſed in the Sacrament, "we ſay thus for all, and for thee: *Keep him, that preaches* "*the truth*. Or it may be thus: *Do thou, Lord, aſſiſt and* "*keep him, that he may preach the truth*; according as it hap-"pens beſt to fall in, and agree with the order of our diſ-"courſe." †

* Epiſt. 33, ad Marcellinam. † Inter Opera Hieron.

CHAP. V.

Of the Sign of the Croſs in Baptiſm.

IT will not be diſagreeable to my deſign, nor I hope to my reader, if, as in ſome former Chapters, ſo here alſo I give an account both of the Conformiſts, and our own opinion concerning this rite, before I come to conſider what our Author ſays in the defence of it.

1. The Conformiſts think, the ſign of the Croſs is alſo a ſign and pledge of the merits of Chriſt. This appears from the following words of the Convocation: "At what "time, if any had oppos'd themſelves againſt it, they "would have been cenſured as enemies of the name of "the Croſs, and conſequently of *Chriſt's merits*, *the Sign* "*whereof* they could no better endure." * What kind of *Sign* they meant, we learn from the *Latin* edition of the Canons, which puts two words inſtead of one, and calls it *Teſſera & ſignum meritorum Chriſti*; whereby they manifeſtly reſtrain the expreſſion to ſuch a kind of ſign, as is alſo a pledge. And there is the more reaſon to judge of the ſenſe of the Church by the *Latin* edition, becauſe the preſent Archbiſhop of *Canterbury* has inform'd us, that it is more authentic than the *Engliſh*. He finds fault with the very title of the *Engliſh* Canons, and alters it; and then adds: "This is the true title given to theſe Canons, and was fit "to be thus particularly taken notice of; becauſe in our "*Engliſh Book of Canons*, which is of moſt common uſe, this "inſcription (as well as many of the Canons themſelves) "is very imperfectly render'd, and may be apt to lead men "into ſome miſtakes concerning theſe, as well as other "matters." † But we, on the contrary, think it unlawful for any man to deviſe ſigns and pledges of the merits of Chriſt, ſince our Saviour himſelf has already appointed ſuch in his Sacraments.

2. Our Adverſaries think, the water in Baptiſm relates only to the virtue and operation of the Holy Spirit, and not to the blood of Chriſt. Hence the moſt learned Mr.

---

* A. 1603. Can. 30. † Bp. *Wake*'s Appeal, *p.* 25.

Mr. *Joseph Mede* observes, there is no mention made of washing in the blood of Christ, thro' the whole Office for Baptism in the Liturgy. And remarkable are the words, in which they pray for forgiveness for the child to be baptiz'd: "We call upon thee for this infant, that he coming "to thy holy Baptism, may receive remission of his *sins by* "*spiritual regeneration.*" We, on the contrary, say, there is a twofold spiritual washing, namely, from the filth, and from the guilt of sin: the former is done by spiritual regeneration, the latter by the blood of Christ; and both are signify'd and seal'd by the baptismal washing. Hence we judge, that the mystical signification of the merits of Christ, which the Conformists, as I said, attribute to the sign of the Cross, belongs really to the baptismal water.

3. Our Adversaries sometimes seem to be of opinion, that as the baptismal water seals the benefits which are bestow'd upon us by God; so the stipulation or covenant on our part, whereby we engage ourselves to God, is represented by the sign of the Cross. Hear again what the Synod says: "And this Sign they [the primitive Christians] "did not only use with a kind of glory, when they met "with any *Jews*, but sign'd therewith their children when "they were christen'd; *to dedicate them by that badge to his* "*service*, whose *benefits bestow'd* upon them *in Baptism*, the "the name of the Cross did represent." * Every one sees the benefits bestow'd by God in Baptism, are carefully here distinguish'd from the dedication of the infant, which is made by the badge of the Cross. To which purpose likewise are these following words of the Canon: "The "Church of *England* hath retain'd still the Sign of it in "Baptism; following therein the primitive and apostoli-"cal Churches, and accounting it a lawful outward cere-"mony and honourable badge, whereby the infant is dedi-"cated to the service of him that died upon the Cross." We, on the other hand, believe Baptism is a pledge and token both of the benefits which God is graciously pleas'd to bestow upon us, and of our acceptance of them, and the promise whereby we oblige ourselves to him; and that therefore no other Sign hereof should be used.

4. Our Adversaries seem to allow the Popish distinction between the flock of Christ, and his militia. Both they and

* Can. 30.

the Papists hold, persons are admitted into the former by Baptism; but as the Papists think we are listed into the latter by Confirmation, our Adversaries think this is done by the sign of the Cross. This appears by the words used at the making the Cross. "We receive this child into "the congregation of Christ's flock, and do sign him with "the sign of the Cross, in token that hereafter, he shall "not be asham'd to confess the faith of Christ crucify'd, "and manfully to fight under his banner, against sin, the "world, and the Devil, and to continue Christ's faithful "soldier and servant unto his lives end." * Where those words alone, *We receive this child into the congregation of Christ's flock*, relate to Baptism, as the Convocation explains them; all the rest belong to the sign of the Cross, which therefore is accounted Christ's *banner*. So that we are made Christ's sheep by Baptism, but his soldiers by the sign of the Cross. And thus Doctor *Hammond* makes the Cross the banner or ensign of Christ's militia, which every one should resort to, and fight under; and the symbol by which men are inroll'd in the Christian militia, and says: "They retain it in their solemn entrance into Christ's "camp, in token they mean voluntarily to fight under his "banners; and in confidence that he that thus sign'd to "*Constantine* victory from heaven, will thus give grace, and "seal to us victory over our ghostly enemies." † Nor is this inconsistent with their speaking *of God's benefits bestow'd in Baptism*. For no other benefits are meant thereby, than regeneration, remission of sin, and admission into Christ's Church: but that other benefits, and particularly those which help us in yielding obedience to the laws of Christ, may be attributed to this Sign, is plain enough from the Liturgy it self. And I have prov'd at large elsewhere, that such a virtue is ascrib'd to the Cross, not only by Doctor *Hammond*, but by their famous Mr. *Hooker*. ‖ But we acknowledge no such distinction between the flock and militia of Christ, and therefore reject this badge, which they have devis'd of the latter.

5. The Episcopal party hold the sign of the Cross was us'd in Baptism from the very beginning of the Christian Church. Thus the Convocation tells us: "The "honour

* Can. 30. † Oper. *vol.* ii. *p.* 243. ‖ Considerat. on the vith chap. of the Abridgment of the *London* Cases, concerning the Cross, *p.* 73. &c.

" honour and dignity of the name of the Croſs, begat a " reverend eſtimation even in the Apoſtles times (for " ought that is known to the contrary) of the ſign of the " Croſs, which the Chriſtians ſhortly after us'd in all their " actions." * But we have very different apprehenſions of this matter. And in the firſt place, 'tis very probable this Sign was brought into uſe by Heretics, *viz.* the *Valentinians*, as I have ſhewn in the foreſaid Treatiſe.† From them the *Montaniſts* receiv'd it, and the firſt plain expreſs mention we find made of it is by *Tertullian*, about the year 200, after he fell into that Hereſy. Secondly, the uſe of this Sign was very ſuperſtitious from the very beginning of it. And ſo Bp. *Crofts* owns: " The ſuperſtition of the " Croſs and Chriſm, were in uſe in the ſecond Century."‖ Laſtly, this Sign was not us'd in Baptiſm in *Tertullian*'s time, nor in the three firſt Centuries. Mr. *Daill* formerly aſſerted this,‡ and I have lately defended his opinion. Upon the whole then, we look upon the baptiſmal uſe of this Sign to be the contrivance of the fifth Century, or the latter end of the fourth. And now having thus given an account of our opinion on both ſides, I return again to our Author.

*Now all this ado is, for want of obſerving, that the Croſs was uſed in Baptiſm many ages before the Church was infected with Romiſh errors.** This is a great miſtake. Tho' it matters very little with us, whether the obſervation of our Author be true or not; ſince the Scripture, and not their practice, is our only rule. However, as I ſaid, this cuſtom was not known before the fourth Century, when the Church fell into abundance of errors, which are retain'd by the Papiſts to this very day. For, had not moſt ſhameful ſuperſtitions crept in at that time about the relicks of the Martyrs, celibacy, this ſign of the Croſs, and many other things? Nay, if we place the beginning of this uſage as high as *Tertullian*, prayers and oblations for the dead will be found as old, ſince they alſo are mention'd by him.

For 'tis mention'd by the oldeſt writers, Tertullian, Cyprian, Lactantius, Prudentius, Paulinus, Baſil, Chryſoſtom, Auſtin, *as a rite of Baptiſm uſed in their times; and they extol it as a very religious uſage, highly becoming the profeſſion of Chriſt.* I

* Can. 30. † *pag.* 57. ‖ Nak. Truth, *p.* 10. ‡ De Cultib. Lat. Relig. *p.* 63. * *pag.* 268.

grant, *Austin* and *Chrysostom* speak of this rite as us'd in Baptism; nor shall I therefore detain the reader in examining their testimonies, or those of *Prudentius*, or *Paulinus*. But let us see upon what ground he brings in the rest as patronizing his cause.

I begin with *Tertullian*, whose testimony, I suppose, will not be much regarded by any one, who considers, the Treatise *De Corona*, which our Author cites, was writ by him after he became a Montanist. In his Book concerning Baptism, where he professedly reckons up the ceremonies us'd in Baptism, he says not a word of the sign of the Cross. Nay, in the other Book *De Corona*, that is, *concerning the soldiers crown or garland*, he speaks not of the baptismal use of this Sign. Nay further, many things used at that time are mentioned by him elsewhere, and in that very place which is cited by our Author, of which there is not the least footstep to be met with in the Church of *England*. 'Twill not therefore be amiss to set down the whole passage. "Lastly, *says he*, that I may begin with Baptism: As we "are going into the water, we protest there, as we did "also before that in the Church, in the presence of the "Bishop, that we renounce the Devil, and his pomp, and "Angels. Then we are dip'd three times, answering "somewhat more than what our Lord has determin'd in "his Gospel. Being thence receiv'd of God as his chil-"dren, we taste a mixture of milk and honey; and from "that time, for a week together, we forbear our ordinary "use of the bath."* Thus far you see he speaks of Baptism, without one word of the Cross. Next he goes on to other customs. "The Sacrament of the Eucharist, "which was appointed by our Lord at a meal time, and "given in charge to all, [I suppose, the Apostles in gene-"ral, and not *Peter* only] we receive in our assemblies "before day, and only from the hands of the Bishop. We "make oblations for the dead, and for their martyrdom on "a stated day yearly. We reckon it unlawful to fast, or to "worship kneeling on the Lords's Day, and all the while "between *Easter* and *Whitsunday*. We take great care that "none of our wine or bread should fall to the ground." And then follow the words cited by the Doctor. "In the "beginning of any business, going out, coming in, dres-"sing,

* De Cor. c. iii.

" ſing, waſhing, eating, lighting candles, going to bed, " ſitting down, or whatever we do, we ſign our foreheads " with the ſign of the Croſs. " A man may look long enough for theſe things in the Church of *England*. No body is according to their diſcipline dip'd three times, or taſtes any mixture of milk and honey, or abſtains from bathing for a week after Baptiſm upon a religious account. They have no oblations for the dead. They reckon that their glory, which the antients judg'd unlawful, *viz.* to worſhip kneeling on the Lord's Day. Beſides, what's this to the Church of *England*'s way of ſigning perſons? *Tertullian* commends the vulgar uſe of the Croſs, ſaying nothing of its being apply'd in Baptiſm; but the Church of *England* retains only the latter, having long ago rejected the former. Let us now imagine *Tertullian*'s authority to be of ſome moment: certainly the Epiſcopal party muſt firſt anſwer the Papiſts argument from it, which is very clear for their common and ordinary croſſing themſelves; before they can with any modeſty refer us to it, who only diſpute againſt the baptiſmal uſe of it. And had there been any uſe of this Sign in Baptiſm in *Tertullian*'s days, who can think he would have paſs'd it over in ſilence in the beginning of the paſſage ſet down, where he mentions their cuſtoms in Baptiſm? or that in the latter end, where he mentions ſo many occaſions of croſſing themſelves, he ſhould not give the leaſt hint of the uſe of this Sign in Baptiſm? Our Author indeed ſeem'd to think, *ad lavacra* refer'd to Baptiſm, which therefore is printed in a different character from the reſt. And if that were *Tertullian*'s meaning, it would prove the uſe of this Sign in his time was very different from that of the Church of *England*. For what does he then ſay? Why; that every one, when he was baptiz'd, us'd to ſign his forehead with the ſign of the Croſs: which is never done by the Church men. For not the perſons baptiz'd, but he that adminiſters Baptiſm, makes the ſign of the Croſs. Further, if this were his meaning, 'tis very ſtrange he did not put his expreſſions into a better order. Had he mention'd this in the firſt or the laſt place, more might be ſaid for ſuch an interpretation; but without doubt he would never mention this venerable Sacrament of our holy religion in the middle of the moſt common actions of our lives, without adding ſome note of diſtinction. But *lavacrum* there ſignifies either the *bath*; or elſe, as the tranſlator has render'd it, *waſhing*.

ing. I prefer the former, as being agreeable to his frequent use of the word. And so much for *Tertullian*. Next comes *Cyprian*.

He tells us of King *Uzziah*, "That God being displeas'd with him, he was mark'd in the same part of "the body, they are, who please the Lord." * But it does by no means hence appear, the sign of the Cross was us'd in Baptism. For *Cyprian* has here no regard to Baptism, but to the vision of *Ezekiel*, *chap.* ix. 4, 5. understanding, indeed, that mark, which God order'd to be set upon the foreheads of those, *that sigh'd and cry'd*, &c. to be the Cross. For thus he writes elsewhere: "But "what this mark was, and upon what part of the body "it was set, God shews in another place, saying: *Go* "*through the midst of* Jerusalem, *and set a mark* upon the "foreheads *of the men that sigh, and cry for the abomi-* "*nations that are done in the midst of them.*" † So that I think *Cyprian*'s meaning may be well enough express'd thus: "God being displeas'd with King *Uzziah*, he was "mark'd in that part of the body, in which God elsewhere, by the Prophet *Ezekiel*, orders those to be mark'd "who please him."

Lactantius, who is next cited by our Author, speaks of the vulgar use of this Sign, in the place refer'd to, and in several others; but never of the Baptismal use of it, that I can find. He calls it, indeed, *Signum illud maximum*. ‖ But he speaks of persons crossing themselves with it, and not of their being cross'd by another; as may appear by the *Jewish* figure or emblem, by which he immediately illustrates the whole matter: "Of which [the "Cross in the forehead] the *Jews* to this day present us "with a figure, when they strike the door-posts of "their houses with the blood of a lamb. For when "God was going to smite the *Egyptians*, that he might "preserve the *Hebrews* from that plague, he commanded them to kill a white Lamb, without blemish, "and to put its blood upon the door-posts of their "houses for a token. Therefore, when the first-born "of *Egypt* died in one night, the *Hebrews* alone were "say'd by this token of blood. Not because the blood "of

* De unit. Eccles. 2 Chron. xxvi. 19. † Ad Demetrianum. ‖ *Lib.* iv. *De ver. sap. c.* 26.

" of a beaſt had ſuch a virtue in it ſelf, as to be " able to ſave men ; but it was the figure of things to " come. For the white lamb without blemiſh was " Chriſt ; that is, he was innocent, and juſt, and holy, " and being ſacrific'd by the *Jews*, he ſaves all thoſe, " who *ſign their foreheads with the ſign* of blood ; that is, " of the Croſs that ſhed his blood. For the forehead is " the *upper door-poſt* of a man, and the wood or poſt " ſtain'd with blood, ſignifies the Croſs." Thus he, who muſt anſwer for the *Jews* ſtriking their door-poſts with blood, after their coming out of *Egypt*, and the colour of the lamb (of which I find nothing in the Scripture) and for the myſtical figure of this Sign, and its ſalutary virtue.

Much the ſame may be ſaid of *Baſil*'s words, that is before of *Tertullian*'s. For firſt, 'tis not certain he ſpeaks of the baptiſmal uſe of this Sign. Nay, that he is to be underſtood of their common daily croſſing themſelves, ſeems plain both by the preface with which he brings in the mention of it, and by the order of his diſcourſe. " That I may, *ſays he*, firſt mention the principal and " moſt common cuſtom, that they who hope in Chriſt, " ſhould be ſign'd with the ſign of the Croſs, *&c.*" * Then he goes on, and reckons up ſeveral cuſtoms they had receiv'd, not from Scripture, but by Tradition ; as praying toward the eaſt ; the uſing other words in conſecration of the elements of the Lord's Supper, beſides what are related by the Apoſtle. And then, at length he comes to Baptiſm, and relates the ceremonies annex'd to it. " We " bleſs, *ſays he*, the baptiſmal water, the anointing oil, " and the Baptiz'd perſon himſelf. By what writings do " we learn this ? Is it not by an unwritten and myſtical " tradition ? Nay, what written word teaches us to " anoint with oil at all ? The trine immerſion, whence " is it ? And ſeveral other things, which are done at " Baptiſm ; as renouncing the Devil, and his Angels, from " what writing have we them ? " But now here, where he expreſly ſpeaks of the ceremonies us'd in Baptiſm, he ſays not a word of the ſign of the Croſs. But if he were to be underſtood as herein ſpeaking of the Croſs in Baptiſm, his authority will as much ſerve the Papiſts cauſe, as

* De Sp. S. c. 27.

as the Church of *England*'s. They argue, from this very place, for anointing in Baptism. How then can our Adversaries urge against us that same testimony of *Basil*, which they reject themselves, when 'tis brought against them by the Papists? They deal very unreasonably with the Fathers, who acknowledge or deny their authority, just as they find it will be to their purpose. Perhaps it may be objected: That Doctor *Hammond* reckon'd Chrism, and many other rites, among the indifferent things, which no one doubts might be commendably us'd, or let alone at pleasure. * But they can't even so escape *Basil*'s censure. For if they will stand to his judgment, those rites can't be reckon'd among indifferent things. "Some, *says he*, "of the decrees and institutions observ'd in the Church, "we have deliver'd to us in writing, and some we have "receiv'd by Apostolical tradition, handed down to us "in a mystical manner. *They have both of them the same* "*influence upon religion.* Nor will any one deny this, who "is but moderately skill'd in ecclesiastical laws. For if "we should attempt the laying aside unwritten customs, "we should, before we were aware, injure the Gospel "in some of the chief points of it: nay, we should reduce "the preaching of it to a bare name." Upon the whole, 'tis not certain from *Basil*'s words, they us'd the Cross in Baptism. I might farther add, that the Treatise it self, or especially the latter part of it, here cited by the Doctor, is thought by *Erasmus*, and other learned men, not to be *Basil*'s own writing. † But I shall now leave our Author's Margin, and go on with his own words concerning the Cross.

Besides, it would be very unreasonable, that we should lay aside a pious rite, which the Church hath us'd almost MDCC *years, only because some among us exclaim against it.* ‖

Whether this be true, let any impartial judges determine, from what has been now said. It seems to be the device of a very corrupt age of the Church. And we are all on our side very unanimous in declaring it unlawful. If this, our opinion, is more owing to the weakness of our understandings, than the strength of our arguments; yet they break the law of charity, who chuse rather to drive their Brethren away from their communion, than to part

* Oper. *vol.* iv. *p.* 869. De confirm. † Vid. Coci Censuram, *p.* 127. ‖ *p.* 269.

part with a thing which they themſelves account ſmall, and their Brethren judge unlawful. And indeed what do we deſire, but that we may follow the direction of our conſciences, without debarring thoſe who are otherwiſe minded, from the free enjoyment of their own opinion? And who will not grant, theſe are very reaſonable conditions? This way of arguing of our Adverſaries is made uſe of by the Papiſts, when they defend themſelves in many of their corruptions, and ſhew an utter averſion to any reformation. The celibacy of the Clergy, is in it ſelf, without doubt, lawful and uſeful, highly extoll'd by the Fathers, and brought into the Church under a pretence of Piety. Why then may not the Papiſts as juſtly turn our Adverſaries objection againſt us, upon them, *That it would be very unreaſonable to lay aſide* a thing ſo long practis'd in the Church, *only becauſe ſome exclaim againſt it*? 'Tis as eaſy for the Papiſts, as our Adverſaries, to pronounce whatever is ſaid againſt them, to be only ſome perſons *exclaiming* againſt a thing.

But let us ſee how he goes on: *When at the ſame time many more dont only reverence it, but are really much in love with it. So that if, for the ſake of our Adverſaries, we ſhould part with it, we are not ſure we ſhall hereby reconcile them to the Church; but we run a manifeſt hazard of frighting away ſeveral of our own people from ſuch Baptiſm, (lame and deficient in their opinion) to that of the Church of* Rome, *as more agreeable to primitive practice.* They cannot indeed be ſure they ſhall *hereby reconcile us to the Church.* For, unleſs other conceſſions are made beſide this, I will paſs my word, the Diſſenters never will be reconcil'd to her. But we are much oblig'd to our Author, for ſetting out the temper of ſome of his party ſo well to the life. Every one will reckon this no calumny, but a certain truth, ſince he himſelf has related it. And who will henceforth think, we have not good reaſon to diſlike this ceremony, which has led their people, by their own confeſſion, into ſuch a ſuperſtitious conceit? For, as our Adverſaries take pretty near the ſame courſe with the Scribes and Phariſees of old; * we argue both from the example of the Apoſtles, and from the declaration of our Saviour, that this ceremony ſhould be aboliſh'd. For building upon ſuch authorities, we think

* Matth. xv. 1, 2, &c. Mark vii 1, 2, &c. *Compare* Col. ii. 20.

think it unlawful to worſhip God with rites not appointed by him, but by the rulers of the Church, even tho' thoſe rites ſhould be innocent in themſelves. *In vain*, ſays our Saviour from the Prophet, *do they worſhip me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men.* But our Adverſaries tell us in anſwer, that then only is the uſe of ſuch rites ſinful, when they are us'd not as indifferent, but as things neceſſary, and that of themſelves pleaſe God: and that there is this difference between the Phariſees and them, that the Phariſees commanded their rites as neceſſary, and the Church of *England* hers as indifferent.* However, they muſt now of neceſſity grant, this ceremony occaſions their own people's ſinning, who uſe it not as indifferent, but exceeding neceſſary; ſince they would look upon Baptiſm itſelf as *lame and deficient* without it, and would run from ſuch Baptiſm to that of *Rome*. But if our Adverſaries were more careful to purge the Church, than to gratify the evil diſpoſitions of ſome perſons, ſuch kind of men, ſo deſperately ſuperſtitious, and ſo unworthy of Proteſtant communion, ſhould rather be diligently ſought, that they might be caſt out of the Church, than be ſo greatly courted to keep in. And I may well apply to this purpoſe, what *Bucer* ſaid of the Popiſh Garments: "If able "Teachers are plac'd in every pariſh, good men will be "pleas'd with the taking away the Garments: and as to "wicked men, their favour (if we would be the ſervants "of Chriſt) is by no means to be ſought; much leſs their "ſuperſtitious humour by any methods to be encourag'd, "and promoted." †

But becauſe the Papiſts have made a ſuperſtitious uſe of the ſign of the Croſs, our Reformers have clear'd it from ſuperſtition, and reduc'd it to its firſt ſtate. I ſhould be glad any one would ſhew us at what time, from the firſt inventing this Sign, it can be ſaid to have been clear from ſuperſtition. And truly, if the moſt antient uſe of it might be thought to have been thus *clear*, that was not in Baptiſm, wherein alone the Church of *England* retains it; but in the common actions of life, as the Papiſts ſtill apply it. This is acknowledg'd by Biſhop *Burnet*: "We find, *ſays he*, the "primitive Chriſtians us'd the making a Croſs in "the

* *See* Sanders's Serm. upon Mat xv. 9. Patrick's Friendly Debate, *p.* 151.
† Scripta Angl. *p.* 458.

" the air, or upon their bodies, on many occaſions. After-
" wards, when a divine virtue was fancy'd to accompany
" that ritual action, it was us'd in Baptiſm as a ſort of
" incantation; for, with the uſe of it, the Devil was ad-
" jur'd to go out of the perſon to be baptiz'd. Such an
" uſage made it a ſacramental and ſuperſtitious action."*
He owns therefore the common uſe of this Sign to have been more antient than the baptiſmal; and that the baptiſmal from the very firſt made the action not only ſuperſtitious, but ſacramental.

For we never uſe it idly, and upon every ſlight fear. † But who does not know this uſe of it was the moſt antient? Our Author cited a little before *Tertullian*, as an abetter of this Sign. I deſire then to know, whether they did not uſe it idly, when, as he ſays, they croſs'd themſelves *upon every motion, when they went out, or came in, when they put on their cloaths, or their ſhoes, went into the bath, came to the table, lighted candles, ſat down, or went to bed*? Now if thus they *uſed it idly*, why do our Adverſaries urge *Tertullian*'s authority? If they did not *uſe it idly*, why does not the Church continue the ſame uſe of the Sign as the Papiſts do to this day? The primitive Chriſtians of the third Century had a moſt ſuperſtitious conceit of the ſtrange virtue of this Sign. Do but hear what *Lactantius* ſays: " Nor can the Devils
" approach to them, on whom they ſee this heavenly mark;
" nor can they hurt thoſe whom this heavenly Sign, as an
" impregnable fortreſs, defends." ‖ If this were true, who would not think the Papiſts the moſt happy people, who are every day thus defended? No doubt they, who had ſuch an opinion of the Croſs, would, *upon every ſlight fear*, ſign their foreheads with it. But if they, good men, were deceiv'd in their opinion, their authority ſhould ſignify nothing with us. But now hear our Author's brave reaſon, why they retain it in Baptiſm.

And leſs than this we could not do, unleſs we would wholly efface this mark of the Lord Jeſus, *and ſo gratify* Mahometans *and Heathens in the higheſt degree.*

If the abrogating the uſe of this Sign be a gratification to *Mahometans* and Heathens, the Church men have gratify'd them long ago, by taking away all uſe of it, except in ſolemn worſhip, at which *Mahometans* and Heathens are never

* Four Diſcourſes to the Clergy, *p.* 291. † *pag.* 270. ‖ Inſtit *lib.* iv. *c.* 27.

ver preſent. They ſee the Papiſts, when they croſs themſelves upon every occaſion; but the Church of *England*'s uſe of this Sign they can never behold, becauſe 'tis only us'd in the Church. Our Adverſaries have been thought to have gratified the Papiſts by retaining this uſe of the Croſs; but we never heard before, that our Brethren abroad had gratify'd *Mahometans* and Heathens by rejecting it. And how comes this to be the *mark of the Lord Jeſus*? We truly acknowledge no mark to be his, which he has not made ſo by his own appointment. And the more we ſee men deſire any mark, they have deviſ'd for him, ſhould be eſteem'd as ſacred, the more vile and abominable we account it, and as ſuch avoid it.

Our Author next ſtarts another of our objections: *But ('tis ſaid) we make a new ſacrament of this ſign of the Croſs.* To this he anſwers: *Let theſe objectors know, that this rite, as it is explain'd by us, and all the Reformed Churches, is as far as poſſible from the nature of a ſacrament.* This is wrong tranſlated; it ſhould be: *This rite is as far as poſſible from the nature of a ſacrament, as that* [*viz.* a ſacrament] *is explain'd by us, and all the Reform'd Churches.* And the next words, and the Doctor's argument ſhews this was his meaning: *For, according to our divinity, can any thing be a ſacrament, but what was inſtituted by Chriſt himſelf?* Dr. *N.* had here his eye to the definition of a ſacrament, in the Church Catechiſm: That 'tis "an outward "and viſible ſign of an inward and ſpiritual grace, given "unto us, ordain'd by Chriſt himſelf, as a means whereby "we receive the ſame, and a pledge to aſſure us thereof." This is the divinity of the Church of *England*, wherein we find no fault. For hence it follows, there are but two ſacraments of the New Teſtament, ſince ſo many, and no more, were ordain'd by Chriſt; as appears by the Holy Scriptures, and is acknowledg'd by all the Reform'd. Nor are we ſo ſtupid, as to object againſt our Adverſaries, *a new ſacrament inſtituted by Chriſt.* But what we blame them for, is, That they have brought into the Church a rite, which has no warrant by any divine inſtitution, and to which they aſcribe in a manner the ſame nature and virtue with ſacraments, tho' at the ſame time they deny it to be a ſacrament. But ſince our Author ſeems therefore to deny this Sign to be a ſacrament, becauſe it was not inſtituted by Chriſt himſelf; I wiſh he had told us plainly, whether he did not think it was appointed by the Apoſtles? If it had been ſo, it would be a ſacrament in our opinion, wherein Bp. *Burnet* agrees

agrees with us. " Whatever, *says he*, his Apoſtles ſettled, " was by authority and commiſſion from him ; therefore " 'tis not to be deny'd, but that if they had appointed " any ſacramental action, that muſt be reckon'd to be of " the ſame authority, and is to be eſteem'd Chriſt's inſti- " tution, as much as if he himſelf, when on earth, had " appointed it." * And truly, if *the Church has uſed this rite almoſt* MDCC *years*, as our Author told us a little before ; I can't imagine, who could be the Author of it, but Chriſt himſelf, or his Apoſtles. But he goes on, and not only denies its being a ſacrament, upon the account of the author of the inſtitution ; but denies it has what is principally neceſſary in the nature of a ſacrament. I have ſhewn already, out of Bp. *Burnet*, that it was antiently a ſacramental action : but let us hear our Author's reaſons.

If it ſhould be granted [which no man in his ſenſes can deny] *that here is an external ſign of a ſacrament, I would fain know what inviſible grace is confer'd with it* ? The baptiz'd perſon is ſign'd, " in token that hereafter he ſhall not be " aſham'd to confeſs the faith of Chriſt crucified, and man- " fully to fight under his banner, againſt ſin, the world, " and the Devil, *&c.*" But who will deny Chriſtian fortitude to be a *grace* ? Who, beſide a *Pelagian*, will doubt whether this grace be *confer'd* by God ? The ſign of the Croſs therefore is made a pledge of this.

But he further asks : *Did ever any of our ſide affirm, that this Sign is the cauſe of any divine infuſion* [influence] *or any means of eternal ſalvation* ? They have indeed *affirm'd* it. Thus I have obſerv'd before, that Dr. *Hammond* ſays : " He " that thus ſign'd to *Conſtantine* victory from heaven, will " *thus* give *grace*, and ſeal to us victory over our ghoſtly ene- " mies." And if that be true, I can ſee no reaſon why it ſhould not be eſteem'd *a means of eternal ſalvation*. Nay if, according to the Convocation, it be *a ſign and pledge of the merits of Chriſt* ; or finally, if it be a token of Chriſtian fortitude, as it really is, as our Adverſaries uſe it ; it may with good reaſon be call'd, *a means of eternal ſalvation*. But now take another of our Author's arguments :

What pledge do our Divines hold to be in this rite, whereby either the hope of a Chriſtian is rais'd, or his faith confirm'd ? Mr. *Hooker*, a moſt admir'd author with our Adverſaries, has

* *Upon the* Art. p. 269.

has attributed an extraordinary virtue to this Sign. "Surely, *says he*, the mind which as yet hath not harden'd it "self in sin, is seldom provok'd thereunto in any gross and "grievous manner, but nature's secret suggestion objected "against it ignominy, as a bar. Which conceit being enter'd "into that palace of a man's fancy, the gates whereof [*viz.* "*his forehead*] have imprinted in them that holy Sign, "which *bringeth forthwith to mind, whatsoever Christ hath* "*wrought, and we vowed against sin*; it cometh hereby to "pass, that Christian men never want *a most effectual*, tho' "a silent *teacher*, to avoid whatsoever may deservedly pro-"cure shame. So that in things which we should be "asham'd of, we are by the Cross admonish'd faithfully of "our duty, at the very moment when admonition doth "most need."* The same author has much more to the like purpose. But I return to the Doctor:

There is nothing in this institution of our Church, can more deserve the name of superstition, than the Independents holding up their hands in token of joining themselves to [*rather*, of receiving persons into] *their congregations. For why should it be more idolatrous and impious, to admit a person into a Christian society, by making a cross with one finger, than by stretching out five?* †

Every body that compares these things together, must needs see how very different they are. 'Tis the way of the Independents, to admit none into their communion, without the consent of the people. And therefore, when the judgment of the people is demanded concerning any one who offers himself to them, they declare it by holding up the hand, or any sign of that nature, rather than by the less decent muttering of *yea*, or *no*. But they place no religion in any such usage, nor pretend to do any thing, but what 'tis common for assemblies to do in giving their votes. And upon this account we never charg'd them with introducing a new sacrament. Nor are we in this matter more favourable to them than the Church men. We never charg'd them with bringing in a new sacrament, by appointing kneeling at the Lord's Supper, because we know it is an ordinary sign of reverence, and is order'd by them as such; altho' at the same time we dislike the thing itself, as will appear afterwards.

CHAP.

* Eccl. Pol. *lib.* v. *sect.* 65. † *page* 271.

CHAP. VI.

Of Godfathers and Godmothers.

THAT the true ſtate of our controverſy upon this head may be underſtood, I ſhall premiſe theſe few things with relation to it.

I. 'Tis not any matter of controverſy between us, whether it be lawful and uſeful, that when infants are baptiz'd, ſome honeſt pious perſons ſhould make a public profeſſion of the Chriſtian faith in the aſſembly, and promiſe to take care (if God ſpares them) that the child, as ſoon as he becomes capable, ſhould be train'd up in the Chriſtian faith and practice. This we readily grant, and require continually ſuch a profeſſion and promiſe of parents, when we baptize their children.

II. Nor do we diſpute, whether any beſide the parents may be allow'd to perform this office. We acknowledge there is a neceſſity they ſhould in ſome caſes: as if the parents are dead; or, by reaſon of their great diſtance, cannot be preſent at the baptizing their children; or if they are ſo ignorant in the Chriſtian religion, or ſo heretical in their opinions, and vicious in their lives, that their promiſe cannot be look'd upon as fit to be taken by the Church. Hitherto we agree, now ſee wherein we differ.

1. We think it very wrong, that parents, without diſtinction, are debar'd performing this office. We apprehend the chief care of the education of children is committed to parents: and they are eſpecially bound to form them to virtue and piety. Hence it ſeems highly requiſite, that ſuch parents, as are fit, ſhould publicly profeſs their faith; and engage for the Chriſtian education of their children. But this they are forbid to do by the Canons of the Church, which ſay: "No parent ſhall be urged to be preſent, "nor be admitted to anſwer as Godfather for his own "child." *

2. We queſtion very much, whether the Miniſter has a ſufficient power of refuſing perſons, who are unfit to perform the office of Sponſors. No one can be refus'd by

* Can. 29.

him, who has receiv'd the holy Communion. * Nay, boys and girls often ſtand Godfathers and Godmothers, tho' they have never receiv'd the Lord's Supper at all. But if the matter be only conſider'd according to the Canon; how many are there now moſt profligate in their lives, who yet, thro' the want of diſcipline, are admitted to the holy Communion? All that can ſay the ſhort Catechiſm in the Liturgy, contain'd in two or three pages, are to be confirm'd by the Biſhop; and then have a right, according to the eſtabliſhment, to come to the Sacrament: nor can a Miniſter debar them above a fortnight, let them live how they will, unleſs he will put them into the Spiritual Court, and be himſelf at a great charge.

3. Another thing here in debate is, whether the queſtions propounded to the Godfathers and Godmothers, and the anſwers they give, are not very ſimple and abſurd? What they are, we ſhall ſee preſently; in the mean while let us return to our Author:

Every man, that is converſant in the writings of the antients, knows very well, that from the very firſt ages of Chriſtianity, there were always ſureties in Baptiſm, who religiouſly engag'd for the faith of the baptiz'd, that they ſhould ſincerely believe all that was reveal'd in the Goſpel, and direct the ſubſequent actions of their lives by the law of Chriſt. †

If that matter is ſo plain to *all that are converſant in the writings of the antients*, it might eaſily have been prov'd by the cleareſt teſtimonies. But I have not yet been ſo happy, as to meet with them. And tho' by the law of charity, we are to believe and hope, that they, who at preſent profeſs the Chriſtian faith, and lead their lives blameleſs, do *ſincerely believe all that* is *reveal'd in the Goſpel*, and will *direct the ſubſequent actions of their lives by the law of Chriſt*; yet whether they really ſo believe, and will ſo direct their actions, can be certainly known to God alone, who ſees the hearts of all men. Nor can any one, without great raſhneſs, promiſe this for another, and eſpecially for infants; in whoſe name alone ſuch promiſes are made in the Church of *England*. For as often as thoſe of riper years are baptiz'd, the Godfathers are only witneſſes of their making ſuch a profeſſion, and ſuch promiſes; but undertake nothing for them as to the ſincerity of their faith, or their future integrity of life.

---

* Ibid. † *page* 273.

life. So that if Dr. *N.* has truly describ'd the customs of the antients, 'tis manifest the Church of *England* has herein forsaken them. I say nothing here concerning the practice of the *Jews*, because we dispute not about *witnesses of the covenant made*; and such witnesses are all those who are present, when any one is baptiz'd. Enough has been said of what next follows. Let us therefore go on to the rest.

Besides, this suretiship, which was begun in the oldest and best times, hath been continued down to us without scruple, and interruption, except the clamours of Anabaptists and Puritans, which have been rais'd against it of late years. * And for this purpose he produces *Justin Martyr*, or *whoever was the author of the Answers to the Orthodox*, who says: *Infants are thought worthy of the benefits of Baptism, by reason of their faith who bring them to it.* And thus the passage of *Justin* is well render'd, which the Doctor had mangled at a miserable rate, and made it sad nonsense, in his translating it, tho' easy *Greek*, into *Latin*. There is nothing in the words thus rightly understood that displeases us.

We are next refer'd to *Tertullian*, whom the Doctor had misrepresented by changing *parvulos* into *parentes*. There is nothing in the place that concerns us, but the mention he makes of *sponsores*, which may as well be the parents as others, if his words are fairly represented.

There was another passage cited out of the same author, which I believe neither our Author, nor any that have commented upon *Tertullian*, understood; but which in the *Latin* edition I have explain'd so, as to shew it signifies nothing against us.

In the next place *Cyril* of *Alexandria* is alledg'd as a witness against us; and his words are thus translated: *The surety says* Amen *for the infant.* The place is not *in* 12 *Evang. Joh.* but *John* xi. 26. But this is not a fair citation; for he only says: *He that brings the infant, &c.* And why may not that as well be the parent? But besides, what is here like the Church of *England*'s answers? Did he that brought the infant undertake for him, that he believ'd all the Articles of the Apostles Creed, that he should *keep God's holy will and commandments, and walk in the same all the days of his life*? This is what our Godfathers undertake; but *Cyril* only says, that he who brought the infant, at the end of the prayers in Baptism answer'd for him *Amen.* And what is

* page 274.

this againſt us? We diſlike not, that both he who brings the child, and the whole congregation too, ſhould do the ſame.

The next author we are refer'd to is *Auſtin*, who really ſpeaks our ſenſe well enough. "Children, *ſays he*, are of-"fer'd, that they may receive the ſpiritual grace, not ſo "much by thoſe in whoſe arms they are brought; though "by them too, if they are good Chriſtians; as by the whole "Chriſtian ſociety." And he preſently adds, what certainly proves parents were not in his time, as they are in ours, forbidden to offer their own children in baptiſm. "You may "ſee, *ſays he*, many are not offer'd by their own parents, "but by ſome ſtrangers, as ſlaves are ſometimes offer'd by "their maſters. And ſometimes, *when the parents are dead*, "children are baptiz'd, being brought by thoſe, who could "ſhew ſuch mercy to them." * And herein we do not differ from him.

In the laſt place, the authority of that vile impoſtor, the *ſham Dionyſius*, whoſe books are ſtuff'd with abundance of ſuperſtition, is urg'd againſt us. But if his words quoted are well conſider'd, it appears, that he ſpeaks only of the children of infidels being deliver'd to Sponſors, and that the faithful were then truſted intirely with the care of their own children. His words are: "They ſay, and 'tis true, "that infants, who are inſtructed in the holy law, will ac-"quire a holy temper of mind, being free from all error, "and wickedneſs of life. When our divine inſtructors "conſider'd this, 'twas thought fit that infants ſhould be "receiv'd after this holy manner; that the natural parents "of the child, that was offer'd, ſhould deliver him to an "initiated or baptiz'd perſon, who ſhould well inſtruct him "in divine matters, under whoſe care he is to be after-"wards, as under a Godfather, or Suſceptor in Baptiſm."† Hence 'tis plain, he ſpeaks of ſuch natural parents as were not themſelves Chriſtians; or why ſhould they otherwiſe, upon the account he mentions, deliver their children to others? Further, it appears he was for having the intire care of the children's education committed to theſe Godfathers: to which purpoſe are the *Scholia* of *Maximus*, and the *Paraphraſe* of *Pachymeres*. If this was required in our nation, there would ſoon be an end put to the practice: for the

* Epiſt. XXIII. † Eccl. Hier. *c.* VIII.

the people in *England* have quite another notion of the matter. But since Archbishop *Usher* has from hence argued the spuriousness of those writings which pass under his name; it will not, I suppose, be amiss to set down his words, before I take leave of *Dionysius*. " Besides, *says he*, he speaks of " Godfathers in Baptism, of whom no footsteps can be " shown in any antient writers, *Greek* or *Latin*, for a long " time after *Dionysius*; altho' they plainly describe the " ceremonies used in Baptism." *

So much for our Author's testimonies; I now proceed to his other arguments. *And no good reason can be given, why, even in our days, the faith and care of some grave persons should not be engaged, that the Church should receive no damage by any one's turning Infidel after Baptism.* † In like manner, say I, since parents of old used to offer their own children to Baptism, and to come under engagements for their Christian education; *no good reason can be given*, why they should now be hinder'd from doing it. Our Author presently acknowledges, 'tis their *great business to give their children a religious education*. Why then may they not be permitted to promise it? If the debtor himself is able to pay, why should we refuse his bond; and then desire some other person, a bankrupt perhaps, to take the debt upon him?

Our Author, as I said, owns 'tis *the great business of parents to give their children a religious education*; but he pleads, that nevertheless this practice may be of good use, because *parents are many times snatch'd away by death, before the children are grown up; or they are too negligent in this particular*, &c. And what does he infer from this? Why, that the engagement of the parent is of no consequence. A fine way of reasoning indeed! But whence will it appear, the Godfathers only oblige themselves upon that condition? This is only the fancy of some private men, which is no where mention'd in the Liturgy or Canons of the Church. And if it were mention'd, 'twould signify but little, unless more care were used in admitting persons to stand as Godfathers. But I will not stay to insist upon these things; but proceed to the arguments of our side, which he comes next to consider.

* Differt. de Script. Dionys. Ar. suppost. *ad fin.* Hist. Dogmat. *p.* 287.
† *pag.* 275.

But 'tis a ridiculous and absurd thing, they say, to put questions to infants, who can make no answer. * You see here the argument only concerns *infants, who can make no answer.* For when the same questions are propounded at Baptism to persons of riper years, who can answer for themselves, we find no fault with them; for they are agreeable and proper enough. Nay, if the Godfathers only promis'd a diligent care about the child's education, we should never blame them for propounding questions of that nature, for we use them ourselves. 'Tis to no purpose therefore, that our Author spends a whole page in talking of baptismal interrogatories in general, as tho' any doubt were made of the usefulness of them. I shall therefore pass over what he says on that head, and come to that part of his answer, which really relates to our objection.

As to the propounding the questions, we dont put them to the infants; but demand of the Sureties in the antient form: Dost thou, in the name of this child, renounce the Devil? Dost thou believe in God the Father Almighty? &c. *Wilt thou be baptiz'd in this faith?* †

Whether the *questions* are *propounded to the infants*, or not, may be easily discern'd by the Liturgy; according to which the Priest thus speaks unto the Godfathers and Godmothers: "Wherefore *this infant must also faithfully for his part*, "*promise* by you that are his Sureties (until he come of age "to take it upon himself) that he will renounce the Devil "and all his works, and constantly believe God's Holy "Word, and obediently keep his commandments. I de-"mand therefore: Dost thou, in the name of this child, re-"nounce the Devil and all his works, the vain pomp and "glory of the world? *&c.* *A.* I renounce them all. "*M.* Dost thou believe in God the Father Almighty? *&c.* "*A.* All this I stedfastly believe. *M. Wilt thou be baptiz'd* "in this faith? *A.* So is my desire. *M. Wilt thou* then "obediently keep God's holy will and commandments, "and walk in the same all the days of thy life? *A.* I will." Who now is so blind, as not to see, the Minister all along asks the infants themselves these questions? Of whom else can he ask, whether *he will be baptiz'd*? or who else can answer, *I will*? For the Godfathers and Godmothers have been baptiz'd themselves long before. 'Tis plain then the God-

* *pag.* 276. † *pag.* 277.

Godfathers are not properly ask'd these questions, and that they answer them for no other reason, but because the infants are not able to speak for themselves. Which to many seems absurd and childish, and unworthy of the gravity of a Christian assembly, and the solemnity of the ordinance of Baptism. Hereto we may add the words of the Catechism: "*Q.* Why then are infants baptiz'd, when, by "reason of their tender age, they cannot perform them "[*repentance and faith*]? *A.* Because they promise them "both by their Sureties, *&c.*" And truly they seem by this method to betray the cause of infants to the Anabaptists. For, if an express and actual profession of repentance and faith is necessarily to be requir'd of every one before he is baptiz'd, Infant-baptism can never be defended; since a vicarious profession is not founded upon any text in the whole Bible.

The Doctor now argues from the method used sometimes in civil affairs. But those state examples he brings are so very different from the matter in hand, that tho' they may seem to illustrate it; yet they can never establish the use of it, or prove it is lawful. But let us briefly consider each example:

By an old law of the Romans *their* Ædilis *was obliged, within five days after admission to his office, to take an oath to observe the laws.* Valerius Flaccus, *after his election, was hinder'd from doing this. His brother, as his proxy, was sworn in his stead: and the Commons pass'd an act, that it should be all one as if he had sworn himself.*

But what are we concern'd in those quirks and fetches, by which Commonwealths have endeavour'd to help the defects and imperfections of their laws? We are not here inquiring, what the Senate or the Commons did at *Rome*, but what our Saviour himself has determin'd in his most perfect law? And indeed, that vicarious oath in the case of *C. Valerius Flaccus*, * was then a thing new and unheard of among the *Romans*, and needed a decree of the Senate, and an act of the Commons on purpose, to make it valid. Wherefore let our Adversaries shew where such a method, as they plead for, is prescrib'd by our Lord Christ, as the other was by the *Roman* Senate, and they presently put an end to this controversy.

* Liv. *lib.* xxxi. *cap.* 50.

Whenever infant Kings are inaugurated, some of the nobility' deputed to represent them, take the usual oaths for them.

The inauguration of Kings and Baptism so far agree, that both of them are covenants; the one between the King and the people, the other between God and men. In the former, if the one party only requires such a vicarious oath of the other, they must rest satisfied in it. Nor will we deny the same to be true with reference to the latter, whenever our Adversaries will prove that God, with whom we enter into covenant by Baptism, has requir'd such vicarious stipulations, or at least signify'd they are not displeasing to him.

So do embassadors for their principals, at the ratifying of any league or articles.

There is a considerable difference between this example, and the thing 'tis brought to confirm. For embassadors execute the commands they have receiv'd from their principals, with their consent and authority; but this neither has, nor can have any place in the Baptism of infants. Besides, in every oath, we either assert the truth of somewhat past or present; or we promise somewhat for the time to come. In the one is requir'd the sure and certain knowledge of the thing, in the other that it be in our own power. If therefore embassadors, taking their oath in the former manner, testify that their principals have solemnly consented to the ratification of the articles, no one can make any difficulty of it. But as to promissory oaths of such things, as 'tis not in the power of those who take them to perform; let them consider how they are to be defended, who venture to bind themselves with them. I should be glad our Adversaries would first prove such kind of oaths are lawful in civil matters, before they attempt to vindicate the stipulations of their Godfathers by them. There's one example more behind, but as little to the purpose as this.

The same do guardians for their pupils. This is true; nor is such a compact vain. For if a guardian makes an agreement with any one in the name of his pupil, he at the same time gives him a power to constrain the pupil to perform the conditions of the agreement; as our Author observes in what he adds: *And the pupils, when grown up, are bound by the laws to stand to what was thus transacted for them.* But who can force one baptiz'd in his infancy, after he is grown up, to believe all the Articles of the Creed, to renounce the Devil and all his works, and to walk in God's commandments?

But

But it seems this is mention'd and defended by *Austin*. For thus our Author observes in the Margin: *When* Boniface *ask'd St.* Austin *the reason why infants were thus interrogated*; Austin *answer'd*: Sicut credere respondetur, ita etiam fidelis vocatur; non rem ipsa mente annuendo, sed ipsius rei sacramentum percipiendo: i. e. *The receiving of the sacrament is enough to denominate them faithful, without an actual consent of the mind.* *

But as *Boniface* thought he herein propounded a most difficult question, so I can hardly think he was satisfy'd by *Austin*'s answer. *Austin*'s meaning is, that when 'tis answer'd concerning the infant, *He believes in God*, a regard is had to the sacrament of faith; and the infant, altho' incapable of faith, is said to *believe*, or to *have faith*, because he receives the sacrament of faith. But I am very apt to think, this explication cannot please our Adversaries. For the infant answers by his Sponsors, that *he believes*, before he receives the sacrament of faith, that is, Baptism. But, as I said before, we pay but little deference to the customs of the fourth or fifth Century, and especially such unintelligible ones as this. After I had written this, I observed, the most learned Mr. *Daillé* had the same apprehensions of the judgment *Austin* gives of this matter. Having set down his words, thus he discourses upon them: "Whether these "things satisfy'd *Boniface* I know not. To me, I confess, "they seem strange. How can the infant, offer'd to Bap"tism, be truly said therefore to have faith, because he has "the sacrament of faith, *i. e.* Baptism, at the time when "he has not yet receiv'd Baptism? nay, who is for no "other reason ask'd the question, than that he may obtain "Baptism, which as yet he wants? As tho' none ought "to be baptiz'd, who does not believe: An Infant is pre"sented to the Minister to be baptiz'd; the Minister, as "tho' he thought it unlawful to baptize even an infant, "except he believes, demands, and which aggravates the "absurdity, he demands of the infant himself, whether he "believes? tacitly implying, he may not baptize him, un"less he does so. Here the Godfather, that the infant "may be capable of Baptism, answers, as his Surety, that "he believes. When *Boniface* was in doubt, how the God"father could truly and certainly affirm this; *Austin* an"swers,

* *pag.* 276.

" ſwers, he could, tho' the infant had not yet faith; becauſe " when he ſays he believes, he only means, he has the " ſacrament of faith. Is not this a brave ſolution of the " difficulty? But, I ſay, the infant has not what you call " the ſacrament of faith; nor if he had, would there be " any occaſion to offer him to you to be baptiz'd. And " therefore, in that very ſenſe *Auſtin* puts upon the anſwer, " the Godfather lies, when he ſays the infant believes, " *i. e.* has the ſacrament of faith." * The reader may ſee more there to the ſame purpoſe: where he ſhews this very abſurd cuſtom was the device of the fourth Century, tranſfer'd from the Baptiſm of the adult to that of infants, thro' a perverſe imitation of antiquity.

But our Author proceeds to another of our arguments: *But they boldly engage for the children, that they ſhall keep God's will and commandments, and walk in the ſame all the days of their life.* Now mind his anſwer: *Well, no more is meant by this, than that the Sureties will uſe their beſt endeavours, that the Children may be inſtructed in true Chriſtian doctrine, calling upon them often to ſerve and fear God, reproving them for any thing that they do amiſs, and labouring to reclaim them.* †

Truly, if the words of the Liturgy would bear that ſenſe, we ſhould not quarrel about thoſe ſtipulations; for we always require ſome of this nature. And yet it would be very unadviſed to expreſs thoſe anſwers, the ſenſe of which ought to be as plain as poſſible, in words that were at leaſt doubtful and intricate, and might perplex the conſciences, not of the common people only, but of thoſe likewiſe, who were perſons of more underſtanding. But the words will not admit ſuch a meaning, as is plain by what I have ſaid. Nor do the words of the Office, cited by our Author, prove it: for the beginning of that exhortation confirms our ſenſe: " Foraſmuch, *ſays the Miniſter*, as this child hath " promis'd by you, his Sureties, to renounce the Devil, *&c.* " ye muſt remember, that 'tis your parts and duties to ſee " that this infant be taught, *&c.*"

But our Author could not any longer refrain from triumphing over his Adverſaries, as totally routed; and tells us what a noble occaſion this affords of extolling their Church. Much of the beauty and triumph of his expreſſion is loſt in the Tranſlation, which is comparatively flat. *And herein our*

---

* De Cult. Lat. Relig. *p.* 91. † *p.* 278.

our Church is highly to be commended for her wise provision, and singular care of little children: but envy itself can hardly find what to blame her for in all this. We leave the thing itself to the judgment of others. But this boasting, vapouring temper of our Adversaries, has brought a great disgrace and reproach upon the nation. Every one knows, the *English* are, almost every where abroad, reckon'd proud and haughty. Nor could I, as often as I have thought of it, ever discover a more probable reason of our passing under so bad a character, than the temper of our Adversaries, in so fondly doating upon, and extremely admiring all the many impertinences of their constitution. Nay, our countrymen, to the great prejudice of piety and Christian charity, are from their very cradles accustom'd to despise and vilify all those Churches, which approve not of these things. But leaving this wide field of glory, to those who are dispos'd for a vain triumph, I hasten to what's behind.

CHAP. VII.

Of Confirmation.

SINCE we apprehend some things are not amiss, which our Author has said upon this head, and yet utterly dissent from him in many others; that we may not fight in the dark, I shall first lay down our opinion in a few propositions briefly, which will give light to what I shall have to say afterward.

1. We do not deny, that 'tis very useful, that such as were baptiz'd in their infancy, should, after they are grown up, publicly profess their faith, and renew the baptismal covenant by their own stipulation before the Church. 'Tis well known, we have always own'd this; and therefore, whatever our Author has alledg'd from *Buxtorf*, concerning any practice of this nature among the *Jews*, I shall pass over, as foreign to our controversy.

2. If imposition of hands be consider'd only as a gesture in prayer, or as an antient manner of blessing, which imports the designation of the person who is bless'd; we are not much concern'd about it. But the thing we find fault with is, that our Adversaries use it as a sign of God's favour. For thus the Bishop prays, according to the Office of Confirmation: "We make our humble supplications to thee

" for

" for these thy servants, upon whom (after the example of " thy holy Apostles) we have now laid our hands, to *cer-* " *tify them (by this sign) of thy favour and gracious goodness* to- " wards them." We think this ceremony, thus used, comes too near to the nature of a sacrament; and the rather, because we find some affirm, 'tis retain'd in the Church, not indeed as a sacrament generally necessary to salvation, but as *a sacramental*. *

3. We think the conditions of Confirmation are too loose. For he that is confirm'd, may presently come to the Communion; and no other qualifications are requir'd, than what a child of five years old may have; namely, to be able " to say the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Ten " Commandments; and answer to such other questions, " as in the short Catechism are contained."

4. We own, hands used to be laid upon such as were baptiz'd from *Tertullian*'s time; so that we need not trouble our selves much about the testimonies of later authors.

5. The antient imposition of hands was very different from that which is now in use in the Church of *England*. That always was join'd with Baptism, this mostly follows it at the distance of many years.

6. We dislike the antient use of this ceremony. For the Holy Spirit was thought to be given by this external visible sign, and a greater virtue was attributed to it, than to Baptism itself. Thus *Tertullian*, the most antient author that mentions this rite: " Not that we obtain the Holy Spirit " in the baptismal water; but being cleans'd in water by " the Angel, we are prepar'd for the Holy Spirit.----Then " comes the laying on of hands, to invite the Holy Spirit by " that benediction.-------Then that most Holy Spirit freely " comes down upon our bodies thus cleans'd and blessed." † In like manner does *Cyprian* discourse: " If a man could be " baptiz'd out of the Church, according to the faith of He- " retics, and yet obtain remission of sins; he could, ac- " cording to the same faith, obtain also the Holy Spirit; " and there would then be no need that hands should be " laid on him, that he might receive the Holy Spirit, when " he came over to the Church." ‖

But our Author affirms, their practice is warranted by the example of the Apostles. *We have*, says he, *the author-* *ity*

* *See* Heylyn Cypr. Angl. *p.* 10. † De Bapt. *c.* 6, 8. ‖ Epist. 73. ad Jubaj, *p.* 201.

rity of the Apoſtles on our ſide. For when it was reported to them, that the Samaritans *had receiv'd Chriſtian Baptiſm, two of their order were deputed to go, and pray over them, and lay their hands on them, that they might receive the Holy Ghoſt.** To this I anſwer: The Apoſtles had indeed receiv'd that power of giving the Holy Ghoſt, by laying on their hands, which our Adverſaries have not yet prov'd to be beſtow'd upon their Biſhops. If the Biſhops claim the power of the Apoſtles, why dont they give a proof of it, by healing the ſick with the laying on of their hands? Certainly they muſt either give us ſome ſuch evidence, to convince us of their power; or they muſt at leaſt acknowledge, the Papiſts have with equal reaſon taken up Extreme Unction and Confirmation, in imitation of the Apoſtles. But tho' we look upon thoſe gifts of the Holy Ghoſt, which they gave, to be extraordinary; yet we dont ſo much urge that, as we do this: That the Apoſtles themſelves were endow'd with an extraordinary power in giving theſe gifts, by the rite of laying on hands. So that our Author does not really meddle with our principal objection, but propounds another: *If it be ſaid, that theſe were extraordinary gifts of the Spirit, common in thoſe times; let them tell us, how they will make it probable, that the power of working miracles was confer'd on almoſt a whole nation? For St.* Paul, *by a ſmart queſtion, denies it, as a very abſurd, incongruous thing:* Do all ſpeak with Tongues?† *Can we think it becoming the whole body of the Apoſtles, that they ſhould ſend two of their principal men, to beſtow promiſcuouſly upon a whole nation, good and bad, the power of working miracles; which yet is no part of Chriſtian religion, nor any ways conduces to good living, the main deſign of our profeſſion?*‖ But that theſe were extraordinary gifts, it is prov'd by two arguments. The one is taken from another Text, concerning the laying on of hands, which is very like to that above mentioned: *And when* Paul *had laid his hands upon them, the Holy Ghoſt came upon them, and they ſpake with tongues, and propheſied.*‡ Since then theſe were extraordinary effects of the Spirit, 'tis plain the gift itſelf was extraordinary. This place our Author preſently cites, but prudently forbears to mention theſe two extraordinary effects, which quite overthrow the very thing he brings it for. Thus he goes on to argue, theſe were not extraordinary gifts: *It can hardly be ſuppos'd, that moſt of them would*

---

* *pag.* 280. † 1 Cor. xii 30. ‖ *pag* 291. ‡ Acts xix. 6.

would employ this gift so much for the establishing of religion, as to make ostentation of what they could do. Yet this is certain, that when St. Paul *had laid his hands on twelve men newly baptiz'd, they were fill'd with the Holy Ghost.* The other argument I urge is this: Unless these had been extraordinary gifts, *Simon Magus* would never have offer'd them money, to move them to give him *this power, that on whomsoever he laid his hands, he might receive the Holy Ghost.* * The ordinary gifts of the Spirit, which cannot be perceiv'd as soon as they are bestow'd, would not have raised the admiration of that wicked man; much less would he have thought it worth his while to part with his money, to purchase an ability to give them to others. But the extraordinary gifts of the Spirit could not but be conspicuous to every one present; so that 'tis no wonder, that such an illustrious display of the Apostle's power should raise the admiration of the vile wretch, and an earnest desire to have the like himself. Nay, that the Apostles did not lay on hands, as our Adversaries pretend, to give the Spirit to *enable by his grace chearfully and readily to perform all good duties*;† but to bestow his extraordinary operations; seems plain to me from hence: That St. *Peter* did not lay hands on *Cornelius* and his Company, who receiv'd the Holy Ghost before they were baptiz'd; || which yet he would without doubt have done, if it had been so very necessary and useful for this purpose. Further, 'tis not yet clear to me, that the Apostles laid hands on all the *Samaritans* without any difference. The Apostles bestow'd those gifts for the advantage of the Church, and did not intrust them all with every person, on whom they laid hands; ‡ but gave to some one kind of gift, and to some another, according as they design'd them to perform this or t'other office; and they herein discern'd and approv'd men by the Spirit. But be that as it will, our Bishops, as I said, have not yet prov'd, that they can impart the Holy Spirit by the laying on of their hands. And let me here take notice by the way, that our Bishops seem to me to imitate not only the Apostles in their Confirmation, but our Saviour himself * in their Ordination, with too great a boldness. For when they ordain either Priests or Bishops, they assume his words, and say: "*Receive the Holy Ghost*, for the office "and

* Acts viii. 18, 19. † *Vid. p.* 287. || *Vid.* Act. x. 44, &c. ‡ *Vid.* 1 Cor. xii.
* John xx. 22.

" and work of a Prieſt [or Biſhop] in the Church of God, " now committed to thee by the impoſition of our " hands, &c." But the Doctor goes on :

*And the ſame Apoſtle ſpeaks of Baptiſm, and laying on of hands jointly, as initiating rites, by which all candidates of Chriſtianity were admitted to the profeſſion of it.** Since the Apoſtles uſed impoſition of hands for various purpoſes, one cannot eaſily be certain of the meaning of that place. It may be underſtood as relating to ordination, the healing the ſick, or the power granted them of working miracles. Nor is it any prejudice to this interpretation, that the Apoſtle calls it a *foundation*. The Apoſtles and Prophets are ſo call'd : *And are built upon the* foundation *of the Apoſtles and Prophets.* † Nay, the foundation of the Church is laid in the inſtitution of the ſacred Miniſtry, and its perpetual edification reſts upon it. ‖ And if the Apoſtle be thought to have reſpect to the extraordinary gifts of the ſpirit, they might well be call'd the *foundation*, as they are ſome of the chief and moſt certain evidences of the Chriſtian religion. But 'tis not good to be poſitive about ſuch a doubtful paſſage.

Our Author next affirms, that Confirmation *has not the ſeal of Apoſtolic authority alone, but is warranted by the practice of all following ages.* ‡ We grant it was uſed from *Tertullian*'s time, as the Doctor preſently takes notice. For after he has mention'd ſome antient writers as witneſſes of what he ſays, he adds : *So that they, who are no hearty friends to it, do however grant it to be as old as* Tertullian, *and that it accompanied the Baptiſm of thoſe times, tho' they will not allow it to be a thing intirely diſtinct from it.** We make no doubt it began about the time of *Tertullian*, and was at firſt annex'd to Baptiſm. Whether our Adverſaries, who think otherwiſe, are in the right or no, we ſhall ſee by and by. But ſince we own this rite to be as old as *Tertullian*, we need not conſider the Doctor's other teſtimonies, which are all later than his time. I only take notice, for the ſake of the reader, that he miſtakes in placing the ſecond Council of *Arles* in the year 390. For the 28th Canon of that Council cites the 2d Canon of the Council call'd *Valenſe*, which ſome think means *Vaiſon*, others *Bazas*. Now this Council was held in Pope *Leo* the Firſt's time, about the year 440.

But

* Hebr. vi. 2. † Eph. ii. 20. ‖ Ibid. iv. 11. &c. ‡ *pag.* 282. * *pag.* 283.

But I return to *Tertullian*, whose meaning is misunderstoo
by our Author. I shall translate the words literally, accor
ing to our Author's citation: "The flesh is wash'd, th
"flesh is anointed, the flesh is signed: *the flesh is shaded*
"*laying on the hand, that it may be inlighten'd both by the soul a*
"*by the Spirit.* The flesh is fed with the body and blood
"Christ."* I have follow'd the Doctor here exactly, th
'tis plain by *Tertullian*'s own words, part of the middle pa
sage should have run thus: *that the soul may be inlighten'd*
the Spirit. Upon the place the Doctor makes this remark: *H*
speaks distinctly of three Christian rites, Baptism, Confirmation, a
the Lord's Supper. But he is mistaken in thinking Confirm
tion is to be consider'd, not as a rite that adher'd to Baptism
but which used to be perform'd separately from it: of whic
he afterwards speaks more at large. But I will prove th
contrary from *Tertullian* himself. For he, in his Treatise
Baptism, gives us this account of the virtue and efficacy
Baptism in general: "The guilt being taken away, th
"punishment is remov'd also. Thus man is brought bac
"to God, to his likeness, who was at first made after h
"image. The image belongs to his shape [*effigies* seems
"be thus used here, and in his Treatise, *De Anima*, *c.* 9.] th
"likeness to his eternal duration. For he receives the
"that Spirit of God, which he had at first by God's breat
"ing it into him; but afterwards lost by his sin."† Hen
'tis certain, *Tertullian* thought the Holy Spirit was alway
given in Baptism; and yet he most expressly denies he w
bestow'd before the laying on of hands. Whence 'tis ev
dent, the laying on of hands was always join'd with Baptism
Nay, tho' he had discours'd in the beginning of that Treati
concerning the great virtue of water; yet here he caution
his readers, not to think that the Spirit was given in the w
ter. "Not, *says he*, that we obtain the Holy Spirit in th
"water; but being cleans'd in the water by the Angel, w
"are prepar'd for the Holy Spirit. There was somewha
"like this before: For thus *John* was first the forerunner
"our Lord, and prepar'd his way: and thus the Angel tha
"presides at Baptism, makes way for the coming of th
"Holy Spirit, by that cleansing from our sins, which ou
"faith obtains, being plighted to the Father, Son, an
"Holy Ghost.------Then being gone out of the water, w
"a

* *Vid. p.* 272 edit. Lat. † *c.* 5.

" are anointed with the bleſſed unction, according to the " cuſtom under the law, when they uſed to be anointed to " the Prieſthood with an horn of oil." * I deſire this may be taken notice of for two reaſons. Firſt, becauſe the Doctor thinks this rite of anointing belong'd properly to Confirmation: for thus he preſently brings in *Theophilus* of *Antioch*, as *taking notice of the Chriſm uſed in Confirmation.* But this is very falſe: for the unction and Confirmation, mention'd by *Tertullian*, differ'd both in their order and their end. Unction preceded, by which all Chriſtians were anointed to the Prieſthood: impoſition of hands follow'd after, for the giving the Holy Ghoſt, as we ſhall ſee preſently. There is therefore no ſtrength in the Doctor's argument, when he would prove Confirmation from the anointing. Secondly, if this anointing belong'd to Confirmation, yet it would from this paſſage appear to have been perform'd immediately after Baptiſm. *Then*, ſays he, *being gone out of the water, we are anointed.* Nay, whoever reads the words of *Tertullian*, according as they are ſet down by our Author, and obſerves the pointing of the ſentence, the diſtinction which the *Italic* character makes of the parts of it, and the remark which he has ſubjoin'd, can't but ſee that the anointing of the fleſh is plainly ſeparated from impoſition of hands; and that the former is comprehended in Baptiſm, and the latter is, as a diſtinct ceremony, ſeparated from it. I ſhould therefore be glad to underſtand, how that place of *Tertullian* can poſſibly agree with the words of *Theophilus*, according to the account our Author gives of them. But I proceed to that paſſage of *Tertullian* which he cites. And that his meaning may be the better underſtood, I ſhall ſet down his words more at large: " After that, hands are laid " on, to invite the Holy Spirit by that benediction. Shall " the art of man be able to bring a ſpirit into the water [by *ſpirit* he means *air*, for he ſpeaks of thoſe muſical inſtruments, which were call'd *Hydraulica*, wherein the pipes were fill'd with water, and the air, forc'd into the bottom of them, by the agitation it caus'd, made the muſic] " and by the " motions of the hand animate the pipes they have join'd " together, to give ſuch a noble ſound; and ſhall it not be " in God's power to make the moſt noble ſpiritual muſic " in his inſtrument, by the means of ſuch holy hands? " Then

* *ubi ſ.*

" Then that Holy Spirit comes freely down from the Fa-
" ther upon our bodies thus waſh'd and bleſs'd, and reſts
" *upon the waters of baptiſm*, as tho' he had found his antient
" ſeat. He deſcended in the ſhape of a dove upon our
" Lord, that the nature of the Holy Spirit might be ſigni-
" fied by an innocent and harmleſs creature, and which has
" no gall in its body: and therefore, *be ye*, ſays he, *inno-*
" *cent as doves*. This alſo was myſtically ſhadow'd forth
" before. For, as after the waters of the flood, by which the
" antient iniquity was purg'd away, that is, as I may ſay,
" after the Baptiſm of the world, the meſſenger which
" brought the news to the earth of God's anger being
" pacified, was a dove, let out of the ark, and returning
" with an olive branch (which among the *Gentiles* alſo be-
" tokens peace) ſo by the like ordering of the ſpiritual
" bleſſing, *this dove the Holy Spirit*, being ſent from heaven,
" where the Church is, that was ſignified by the ark, *flies to*
" the earth, *i. e. our fleſh, getting out of the water* after our
" old ſins are waſh'd away, and brings the peace of God
" with him."* From this place, wherein *Tertullian* ex-preſly treats of this matter, we are to explain his meaning in the other paſſage, where he only mentions it by the by. Nor does he there in the leaſt hint, that impoſition of hands was ever ſever'd from Baptiſm. And now ſince I am fallen upon this ſubject, I will firſt make an end of it, before I conſider what our Author ſays of the antiquity of this rite. Let us therefore hear what he holds concerning it.

The primitive Church made Confirmation and Baptiſm two diſtinct things; *ſo St.* Cyprian *aſſures us, who calls them two Sacraments in expreſs words. Cyprian*'s words alledg'd in the margin are: " It ſignifies little for them to receive impoſition
" of hands, unleſs they have the Baptiſm of the Church.
" For then only can they be wholly ſanctified, and be the
" ſons of God, if they are regenerated by both ſacra-
" ments."† No one doubts the baptiſmal waſhing, and the laying on of hands were two different rites. But the only queſtion here is: Whether the latter did not antiently always accompany the former, except perhaps when ſick perſons were baptiz'd, or when Deacons adminiſtred the ordinance? Now when infants are baptiz'd in the Church of *England*, Confirmation is always defer'd, which we think is

* *cap.* 8. † Epiſt. 72.

is quite contrary to the cuſtom of the antients. Nor does *Cyprian*'s teſtimony confirm our Author's opinion. For an argument from the word *Sacrament* is of no weight. For thus *Cyprian* ſpeaks of *the Sacrament of the Lord's Prayer:* and the Biſhop of *Oxford* well obſerves upon the place, that *no word is of a more looſe ſignification in eccleſiaſtical writers than this word Sacrament.** And therefore we need not trouble our ſelves much about that.

But our Author goes on: *That which made ſome think, that Confirmation was much the ſame thing with Baptiſm, was this; that adult perſons, who were commonly baptiz'd in thoſe days, being at years of diſcretion, and able to give an account of their faith, were immediately confirm'd as ſoon as they were carried out of the water.* † You ſee now how exactly our Churchmen order all their matters according to the rule of antiquity. Such as were of age when they were baptiz'd, had hands, you muſt believe, laid upon them immediately; but when infants were baptiz'd, that rite was defer'd till they were grown up, and were *able to give an account of their faith.* So Dr. *N.* would perſuade us. But by what authority or example will he make this appear probable? Truly the contrary is evident from *Cyprian*, who informs us, that all baptiz'd infants were then admitted to the Lord's Supper: which cuſtom continu'd a long time in the Weſtern Church, as it does in the *Greek* Church to this day. ‖ But there is a profound ſilence in all eccleſiaſtical writers concerning perſons being confirm'd, after they had receiv'd the Lord's Supper. But I will tranſcribe a notable paſſage of *Cyprian*, whence 'tis certain all baptiz'd perſons were antiently thought fit for Confirmation. He is diſputing againſt Pope *Stephen*, who was for having thoſe who came off from the Heretics, receiv'd into the Church by impoſition of hands, without another Baptiſm; and thus he writes: "Or if "they attribute the effect of the Baptiſm to the majeſty "of the Name, that whoever are any where, or any how "baptiz'd in the name of Jeſus Chriſt, muſt be reckon'd "renew'd and ſanctify'd; why ſhould not hands as well "be impos'd among them in the ſame name, that men may "receive the Holy Ghoſt? why ſhould not the ſame ma-

* De Orat. Dom. p. 142. † *pag.* 284. ‖ De Laps. *p.* 132. *Vid.* Auguſt. de peccat. meritis & remiſs. *c.* 24. & Innocent. Epiſt. ad Concil Milevit. *inter* Auguſt. Epiſt. 93.

" jesty of the same name, which they plead is able to " sanctify their Baptism, be more able to ratify their impo- " sition of hands? For if a man being born out of the " Church may become the temple of God; why may not " the Holy Spirit be pour'd out upon a temple? *For he* " *that, having put off his sins in Baptism, is sanctified, and spiritu-* " *ally form'd into a new man, is made fit to receive the Holy Ghost.* " Since the Apostle says: *As many of you as are baptiz'd into* " *Christ, have put on Christ:* he that can put on Christ, being " baptiz'd among the Heretics, can much more receive " the Holy Ghost, whom Christ sent. *But thus he that is* " *sent, would be greater than he who sent him; so that a man bap-* " *tiz'd out of the Church would begin to put on Christ, but not be* " *able to receive the Holy Spirit; as tho' Christ could be put on* " *without the Spirit, or the Spirit be separated from Christ.* And " since the second birth is spiritual, by which we are born " in Christ by the laver of regeneration; 'tis simple for " them to say, that a man may be spiritually born among " the Heretics, whom they deny to have the Spirit. *For* " *water alone can't wash away sins, and sanctify a man, unless* " *they have also the Spirit.* Wherefore they must of necessity " grant, either that the Spirit is there, where they say " there is Baptism; or that Baptism is not there, where " they say there is not the Spirit; *because Baptism cannot be* " *without the Spirit.*" * Hence he calls imposition of hands the *Lord*'s seal, and says, the baptiz'd were *compleated there-* *with.*† So that imposition of hands always accompany'd Baptism, whenever it was administred by those who had the power of blessing in this manner; at least it did so always, except when sick persons were baptiz'd in their beds; in which case the laying on of hands was defer'd in the Church of *Rome*. I said in the Church of *Rome*, because that appears from Pope *Cornelius*'s Letter, who writes thus: " But " neither did *Novatian*, when he recover'd from his di- " stemper, partake of those other things, which a man " ought according to the law of the Church, nor was he " seal'd by the Bishop. And since he receiv'd not this, " how could he receive the Holy Ghost?"‖ But perhaps there may be reason to doubt, whether this was the custom in other Churches. I am apt to suspect it was not in

* Epist. ad Pomp. 74. *p.* 213. † Epist. ad Jubajan. ‖ *Apud* Euseb. H. E. *lib.* vi. *c.* 43.

in the Church of *Carthage*, from what *Cyprian* says concerning persons so baptiz'd: "Have they [these Clinics] "obtain'd the Lord's favour, but only in a lesser measure "of the divine gift, and of the Holy Spirit; so that they "may be reckon'd Christians, but yet may not be equal'd "to the rest? Nay, but the Holy Spirit is not given by "measure, but is wholly pour'd out upon him that be-"lieves."* Wherefore since *Cyprian* does elsewhere plainly enough hint, that the Holy Spirit was given by imposition of hands, as I have shewn already; we must conclude, either that at *Carthage* hands us'd to be laid immediately upon such persons when they were baptiz'd; or else, that *Cyprian*'s words must be explain'd by that rule which he delivers in the same Epistle: "That in the sa-"craments of our salvation, when necessity urges, and God "grants his dispensation, divine abridgments convey the "whole benefit to believers."† I would not here positively determine any thing, but leave it to the judgment of the learned. However that be, it can never be prov'd, that in the antient Church, such as were baptiz'd in their infancy, had hands laid on them after they were grown up. Nay, they that thought the baptism of Heretics invalid, and pleaded, that such as had been baptized among them, should be admitted into the Church by a new and catholic Baptism; yet would not have such persons baptiz'd, if they had been a good while in the communion of the Catholic Church. This is expresly asserted by *Dionysius* of *Alexandria*, an earnest defender of that opinion.‖ And most certainly then, they would not lay on hands upon those, who from their infancy had used to receive the Holy Communion.

But I shall now go back to what our Author says of the antiquity of this rite: *But they are quite mistaken who think* Tertullian *was the first that mention'd it. For before him* Irenæus *speaks of it, as what the* Valentinians *had corrupted.*‡ And in his Margin he refers to what is set down in the *Latin* edition: *That among the mysteries of the* Valentinians, *which they receiv'd from the Orthodox*, Irenæus *mentions, Redemption to perfection; I am confirm'd, I am redeem'd. Presently he adds: After that they anoint, &c.* I shall set down

* Epist. ad Magnum, *p.* 187. † *p.* 186. ‖ Apud Eusеb. H. E. *lib.* vii. *c.* 9. ‡ *p.* 283.

the place presently. But I can't but wonder at our Author, that he should represent *Irenæus* as affirming what he does not so much as mention. And if any wou'd see how fairly he deals with us, I would earnestly desire them to read that whole Chapter in *Irenæus*. * He there relates the abominable worship of the Heretics, wherein they differ'd very much from one another. But he no where says they borrow'd those things from the Orthodox. He speaks of their ceremonies, as brought in by *Satan* (and I hope he was not among the Orthodox) to the denying of the Baptism of regeneration towards God. Hence they prefer'd their *redemption to perfection*, mention'd by the Doctor, to Baptism; and said, according to their nonsensical divinity, wherein they distinguish'd between Jesus and Christ: "That the Baptism of the appearing Jesus was for the "remission of sins; but the *redemption* of that Christ, who "came down in him, was for *perfection*." But let us see what the mysteries were, which the *Valentinians* had borrow'd from the Orthodox. "Some of them, *says he*, pre- "pare a bride chamber, and so initiate persons in their "mysteries, using some profane words over those that are "initiated, and this they call spiritual marriage.---Others "pronounce certain *Hebrew* words, which might amaze and "affright those who are initiated, as: *Basima Chamosi*, "*Baaionora*, *&c.* And these things are said by those who "are the initiators. But he that is initiated answers: "*I am confirm'd, I am redeem'd:* and I redeem my soul from "this *Æon*, and every thing in it in the name of *Jao*, "who redeem'd his soul for the redemption that is in the "living Christ. Such as are present answer: Peace be to "all upon whom this name rests." And is not this fine stuff, for the *Valentinians* to borrow from the Orthodox? But *Irenæus* goes on, and adds what our Author has cited. "After this they anoint the person whom they initiate, "with the juice of balm. And they say, this ointment "is a sign of that sweet savour that is upon the universe. "Some of them think it needless to bring a person to the "water; but mixing water and oil together, with such "kind of words as I mention'd before, throw it upon the "head of him that is initiated: and this they would have "to be redemption." *Petavius* the Jesuit, in his Notes upon

* *Lib.* i. *c.* 13.

on this laſt paſſage, cited by *Epiphanius*, ſays they herein aped the Catholic Church : and Dr. *Hammond* agrees with him. * But no body before Dr. *N.* ever ſaid, *Irenæus* ſpeaks of this *among the myſteries which the* Valentinians *borrow'd from the Orthodox*. And indeed a Proteſtant Divine ſhould be aſham'd ſo to explain *Irenæus*, however it may be born in a Papiſt. For it may indeed favour the Papiſts, who retain unction in Baptiſm ; but it ſignifies nothing to the Churchmen, who have laid it aſide long ago. Further, by ſuch a manner of interpreting the *Valentinian* myſteries, a man may evidence not only the baptiſmal anointing, but the Popiſh extream unction to be very antient. For *Irenæus* preſently ſpeaks of that alſo as uſed by them : " There are " others, *ſays he*, who redeem the dead [or dying] throwing " upon their heads oil and water, or the foreſaid ointment " with water." So that we ſhould rather ſay, that the Orthodox receive their unctions from the *Valentinians*, and ſuch like Heretics. But if it were otherwiſe, I profeſs I dont ſee what it could ſignify. For I have already prov'd from *Tertullian*, that unction and impoſition of hands were quite different rites.

And Theophilus *of* Antioch, *ſenior to both, takes notice of the Chriſm uſed in Confirmation*. His words are : *We are call'd Chriſtians, becauſe we are anointed with the oil of God.* † Mr. *Daill* has ſo fully explain'd the meaning of *Theophilus*, that I may anſwer in his words : " The anointing with oil " ſeems to have been the firſt, and moſt antient of all the " ceremonies, that men added to Baptiſm. *Vicecomes* " makes ſome words of *Theophilus* of *Antioch*, who flouriſh'd " about 30 years after *Juſtin M.* wrote his *Apology*, to relate " hereunto. ‖ *Bellarmine* had rather wreſt the place to " Chriſm in Confirmation. ‡ But neither of them hit the " ſenſe of that writer. He is reproving and refuting the " Pagans that derided the Name *Chriſtian* ; he ſhews that " hardly any of the works of art or nature are uſeful, un- " leſs they are anointed ; neither a houſe, nor a ſhip can " be of any ſervice, unleſs it be anointed ; that new born " infants, and wreſtlers when they were about to wreſtle " were anointed with oil ; that no curious and neat work " will ſhine unleſs it be anointed. *Beſides*, ſays he, *the air*

* De Confirm. *cap.* vi. *ſect.* i. † Lib. i. ad Autol. ‖ Lib. ii. *cap.* 35. p. 387. ‡ De Confirm. *ſect.* 8.

" *and the whole earth that is under heaven, is in a sort anointed* " *with the light and the wind.* And then applying these " things to the business of Christianity, he thus bespeaks " the Pagan, who makes a jest of our name and denomi- " nation: *But you will not be anointed with God's oil. We are* " *therefore call'd Christians, because we are anointed with God's* " *oil.* Thus *Theophilus:* whom the *Latins* understand to " speak of a material, corporeal and sensible oil, some of " one sort, others of another; *Vicecomes* of that us'd at " Baptism, *Bellarmine* of that of Confirmation. But I " take him to mean a spiritual oil, and a mystical unction, " of the same kind with that with which Christ was " anointed, which flows down upon us from him who is " our head and high Priest; from whence he has his name, " and we ours thro' him: that heavenly unction, without " which we lie by quite sluggish, unactive and useless, nei- " ther fit to fight, nor to live, being destitute of every " thing that is neat and comely: lastly that unction which " consists of *light and spirit*, which inlightens, and purges " the soul, as the light and wind do the air, *i. e.* which, " as St. *John* says, teaches us all things, and which, as the " same Apostle writes, is the anointing we have of the " holy one, *i. e.* as *Theophilus* comprehends it all in one " word, *the oil of God.* These things relate not to the " oil of the Catechumens, or the Chrism of Confirmation. " They all belong to that Divine Spirit, by which we are " anointed in the Lord Christ."* So far Mr. *Daillé*. I cannot but here take notice of an observation, made by an ingenious and learned writer of the Church of *England*, who, having treated of the novelty of anointing in ordina- tion, adds: " So that when *Gregory Nazianzen* and others " speak of an unction, they are to be understood as speak- " ing mystically of the spiritual unction of the Holy " Ghost."† And I cannot imagine, why the same ob- servation is not to hold good concerning the words of *The- ophilus*. But in whatever sense his words are taken, 'tis plain from what is said before, they are nothing to our Au- thor's purpose. And so much for the antiquity of Confir- mation: now our Author proceeds to shew, that the power of ministring it, is only granted to the Bishops.

We

* De Cu. Lat. relig. *p.* 49. † Bingham Orig Eccl. *vol.* i. *p.* 355.

We *say likewise, that the power of giving this solemn blessing, is lodg'd in the Bishop alone. To this Order all antiquity have agreed to ascribe it:* * And yet he himself in his *Latin* edition sets down the Canon of the Council of *Eliberis*, that gives the power even to a Deacon: "If any Deacon go-"verning the people without a Bishop, or a Presbyter, bap-"tizes any, he must confirm them:" † for so our Author understands the expression, *eos per benedictionem perficere*. Our Author would not juggle, as the Papists do, about this Canon. For they interpolate it, and read, *the Bishop must confirm them*. I cannot therefore here but commend his faithfulness and ingenuity. But 'tis plain the Canon, as he has set it down, is very contrary to his opinion, as well as to the Papists; ‖ and therefore Dr. *Hammond* was for abetting the Popish interpolation. ‡ There is a Canon of another of the Councils to the same purpose; for it not only allows, but commands Presbyters and Deacons to anoint persons: "No Minister, "who has power to baptize, shall ever go without *Chrism*; "because it seems good to us that every one should be once "anointed in Baptism." * But let us hear what our Author says further of this matter: *even* St. Jerom *himself, who was no flatterer of Bishops* [viz. *ascribes Confirmation to them.*] *Jerom*'s words are: *The Bishop goes abroad to lay on hands to give the Holy Spirit.* † I have observ'd before out of *Clement* of *Alexandria*, that Presbyters us'd antiently to lay on hands. 'Tis possible a different custom might prevail in many Churches in *Jerom*'s time, and this power might then be reserv'd peculiarly to the Bishops. But that this was not a custom universally receiv'd in the Churches, I shall shew presently. Further, since Dr. *N.* argues from *Jerom*'s words, 'tis to be observ'd, he talks only of the custom, which obtain'd at that time; but he was of a very different opinion as to the right of Bishops, as will appear by his own words. "But if you ask here, why he that is "baptiz'd in the Church, does not receive the Holy Ghost "(whom we all assert to be given in Baptism) but only "by the hands of a Bishop? You must know that this "practice comes down to us grounded upon this authori-"ty, that it was some time after our Lord's ascension, that "the

* *Pag.* 284. † Can. 77. ‖ Vid. Dail de Colt. Lat. relig. *p.* 265. ‡ De Confirm. *cap.* ii. *sect.* 5. * Concil. Aurasiac. can. i. *vid. c.* ii. *item* Concil. Hispal. *p.* vii. † Dialog. adv. Luciferi.

" the Holy Spirit deſcended to the Apoſtles. And we *find* " *the ſame thing done in many places*, rather for the honour of " the Prieſthood, than from any obligation of law. Other- " wiſe if the Holy Spirit only comes at the prayer of a " Biſhop, they are to be lamented, who, being baptiz'd " by Presbyters and Deacons in little villages and caſtles, " have died before they were viſited by Biſhops."* *Jerom* ſays well that this was *done in many places*; for in ſome they had a different cuſtom. *Hilary* the Deacon tells us: " Preſ- " byters confirm'd in *Egypt*, if the Biſhop was not pre- " ſent." † And the Council of *Orange* ſays: " If Here- " tics at the point of death deſire to become Catholics, " and a Biſhop is not to be had, they may be confirm'd " by Presbyters with Chriſm and the Benediction."‖

But now he *appeals for this to a higher teſtimony, that of the Holy Scripture. Where*, ſays he, *we find* Philip *the Evangeliſt, of no mean figure in the Church, converting the* Samaritans, *and giving them Baptiſm; but there, as a modeſt man, he ſtopt: he would keep within the bounds of his office, and not meddle with the Epiſcopal buſineſſes.* Thus the paſſage is to be ren- der'd, the Tranſlator left out ſomewhat of his Author in this place. In anſwer, I obſerve ſome Churchmen pretend the Biſhops are ſucceſſors to the Evangeliſts, and ſo are ſuperior, as *Timothy* and *Titus* were, to ordinary Presbyters. And truly that Evangeliſts were plac'd in an higher degree, than Paſtors, is plain enough from the Apoſtle, *Eph.* iv. 11. Nay if *St. Paul* commands *Timothy* the Biſhop only to do the work of an Evangeliſt; ‡ how comes it to paſs the Biſhops are now got above the Evangeliſts? And how ſhall we be ſure of *Philip*'s *modeſty*, that *he would not meddle with Epiſcopal buſineſſes*? I wiſh our Author had clearly explain'd to us, for what reaſon we ought to account *Philip* the Evangeliſt inferior to Biſhops, and *Timothy* in like manner an Evan- geliſt equal to them. But let us hear the reſt: *He reports the ſucceſs of his preaching to the Apoſtles; who ſent two of their own body to confirm theſe Proſelytes by impoſition of hands.* But this is the thing to be prov'd, that their ſolemn benedic- tion was of the ſame nature with the Church of *England*'s Confirmation. But he now moves a queſtion upon this:

Now if Philip *was as much impower'd to confirm his converts, as to initiate them by Baptiſm; what occaſion was there for two of the*

---

* Ibid. † In Eph. iv. 11. ‖ Can. II. ‡ 2 Tim. iv. 5.

the Apoſtolic order to be ſent from Jeruſalem *to a foreign people, to do that for them, which, according to the principles of our Adverſaries,* Philip, *or any other inferior Miniſter, might have done as well?* * The anſwer is eaſy. The Doctor was miſtaken in affirming *Philip*, or any other Paſtor, inferior to the Apoſtles, might according to our opinion have perform'd this. For we think, the extraordinary gifts of the Holy Ghoſt were beſtow'd by the Apoſtles, who alone had that inherent power. I have already ſaid, it ſeems more probable, that the Apoſtles did not lay hands on all the believing *Samaritans*; but beſtow'd thoſe excellent gifts, which at that time accompanied this rite, upon ſome particular perſons, deſign'd to ſome ſacred function, for the benefit of the whole congregation. Hence when any perſon that was converted was baptiz'd alone, and there was no ſuch congregation of Chriſtians, he was not ſent to the Apoſtles to be confirm'd. Thus the Eunuch was baptiz'd by the ſame *Philip*, but we read nothing of his being ever confirm'd by the Apoſtles. And yet if every Chriſtian might have obtain'd thoſe gifts of the Spirit, who can believe the Eunuch would not have return'd to the Apoſtles? The antients thought he receiv'd at his Baptiſm the ordinary gifts of the Spirit neceſſary for Chriſtians; which is alſo expreſly aſſerted in ſome copies of the New Teſtament. And ſo it was in *Jerom's*, who therefore ſays: "Unleſs perhaps the Eunuch, baptiz'd by *Philip* the Deacon, is to be thought not to have had the Spirit;" concerning whom the Scripture ſpeaks thus: "*And they both went down into the water, and* Philip *baptiz'd him. And when they departed from the water, the Spirit came upon the Eunuch.*" † And Dr. *Mills* tells us, this reading is found in ſeveral very antient copies.

Hitherto I have conſider'd, and, I hope, ſufficiently refuted, what our Author has alledg'd, both for the antiquity and ground of this rite of Confirmation, as 'tis uſed in the Church of *England*. He now propoſes ſomewhat we very much diſlike in it: *But we, as well as the Papiſts, exalt Confirmation to the dignity of a Sacrament.* To this he anſwers: *How do the objectors know this? Can they ſearch our hearts, and ſee our thoughts?* We neither can do it, nor do we pretend to it; but we gather this from the very words of the Liturgy, as was ſaid in the beginning of this Chapter.

Our

* *Pag.* 235. † Dial. adv. Lucif.

Our Author here reckons up the advantages of Confirmation; but I forbear to say any thing concerning them, because our opinion may be easily enough perceiv'd, by what has been already said. We dont much find fault with the rite itself; nay we think it might be made useful. However, I cannot but wonder, our Adversaries, who attribute so great usefulness to it, have hitherto taken no more care of their own people, and have not made it their business so to order matters, that all persons of their Communion may be in a capacity of receiving this so great benefit. How many baptized persons of their Church are there here in *England*, who never have any opportunity of being confirm'd by the Bishop? Nay how many are there in both the *Indies*, who must absolutely despair of it? If the advantages of Confirmation are so very great, and none but Bishops have the power, why dont they create more Bishops to administer it? Why do they commit to the single Bishop of *London* so vast a Dioceſs, which 'tis impossible for him to serve, in this most profitable rite? Certainly if our Adversaries believe themselves, when they are extolling Confirmation; they seem to have a much greater regard to the honour of their Bishops, than to the edification of the Church.

Our Author in the conclusion of this Chapter cites Mr. *Calvin*, who says: *Such an impoſition of hands, only by way of benediction, I like well, and would gladly ſee it reſtor'd to its primitive* [rather, *its pure*] *uſe.* * And he might have cited several Dissenters, who have in their writings said as much for it as Mr. *Calvin*. But any one who reads all that Mr. *Calvin* says about it, will find that he shrewdly expoſes our Author's opinion, and the arguments with which he defends it in this Chapter.

CHAP. VIII.

Of the Surplice, and other Eccleſiaſtical Habits.

I Will here premise, as I use to do, a few things, that the reader may be acquainted with our opinion, and easily see what is the thing here in controversy.

1. We

* *pag.* 287.

1. We dont ſay, the Habits we diſpute about are in themſelves unlawful. The form, the color, or the matter of mens Garments, is of itſelf, neither good, nor bad. And if theſe Linnen Garments were from their common uſe reckon'd decent, no body would deny them to be alſo decent in divine ſervice. Wherefore,

2. Since theſe Linnen Garments are neither in their own nature, nor by any uſe receiv'd among us, more decent than others; and yet our Adverſaries pretend they are injoin'd by virtue of the Apoſtles words, who commands *all things to be done decently and in order*; * we think they have no reaſon to alledge the Apoſtles authority in behalf of their appointment. In St. *Paul*'s account, thoſe things only are indecent, which are contrary to the law of nature, or Scripture, or to the common uſe of the country, where we live; as is manifeſt to thoſe who compare the xiv and xi Chapters of the 1 *Corinth.* together. If therefore theſe be avoided, all things are done decently.

3. We ſee a kind of ſanctity and holineſs attributed to theſe Garments. Thus Dr. *N.* calls Miniſter's ordinary habit *profane*; and thinks it not fit they ſhould come in it to offer up public Prayers, or to adminiſter the Sacrament. But to us it ſeems ſuperſtitious, for men to place an holineſs in a thing, in which God has placed none; and therefore we are of opinion, that the Garments which are common to Miniſters with other men, and which are decent in their ordinary uſe, are alſo fit enough for Miniſters in the execution of their ſacred office; nor do we make any diſtinction here, as tho' one Garment was holier than another.

4. Since theſe Garments are reckon'd among the ceremonies of the Church of *England*, what ſhe declares of them in general, ſhe muſt be underſtood to think of theſe Garments in particular. Now thus ſhe expreſſes her opinion in the Preface to the Liturgy: "Other "[ceremonies] there be, which altho' they have been "deviſed by man; yet 'tis thought good to reſerve them "ſtill, as well for a decent order in the Church, (for "the which they were firſt deviſed) as becauſe they "pertain to edification, whereunto all things done in the "Church (as the Apoſtle teacheth) ought to be refer'd."

And

* 1 Cor. xiv. 40.

And afterwards ſpeaking of the Chriſtian religion, they ſay: 'Tis " content only with thoſe ceremonies, which do " ſerve to a decent order and godly diſcipline, and ſuch " as are apt to ſtir up the dull mind of man to the " remembrance of his duty to God, by ſome notable and " ſpecial ſignification, whereby he might be edify'd." Now what could the Phariſee ſay more, of their ceremony of waſhing hands before meat? Why ought not we then to reject theſe ceremonies of the Church of *England*, by the ſame right, that the Diſciples of Chriſt rejected thoſe of the Phariſees? Will not our Saviour's words as well ſerve to defend us as them?

5. By the confeſſion of our Adverſaries, theſe Garments have been defil'd with the moſt abominable ſuperſtition by the Papiſts. What reaſon then can there be, why a Reform'd Church ſhould affect a likeneſs to the Whore of *Rome*?

6. The uſe of theſe Garments in the Church is not very antient; nor did it begin before the Church was in a very corrupt ſtate.

7. Theſe Garments have been all along an offence to very worthy men, ever ſince the Reformation; not only to our predeceſſors, who were call'd Puritans, but to many of the moſt conſiderable Biſhops of the Church of *England*, as I have ſhewn in the Firſt Part of this Vindication. 'Tis certain, that upon the account of theſe Habits, and ſome other ceremonies, the Church has been depriv'd of the labours of very excellent Miniſters, and that the conſciences of others have been grievouſly wounded. Now put the caſe we are deceiv'd in our opinion of theſe things; yet it cannot be deny'd, we are deceiv'd in the company of very wiſe and good men. And ſince the things themſelves are uſeleſs, if they are lawful, they who join in them, and without any neceſſity give an occaſion of offence to their Brethren, and for ſuch a trifling matter deprive them of their Miniſtry, as tho' they were unfit for the ſacred office, nay and rend the myſtical body of Chriſt for a thing of nought, muſt deſervedly be reckon'd guilty of a very grievous ſin.

Let us now come to our Author: who in the firſt place defends *the richer attire of Biſhops, and other Dignitaries.* *

* *page* 289.

I have already treated of these dignities themselves, and therefore think it needless to add any thing concerning the Garment belonging to them. But whereas he says: *Such ornaments are useful, in that they gain respect and good esteem, among the common people, to him that wears them:* It seems to me little and mean, that the Ministers of the Church should by such arts court the favour of the ignorant common people. Christ never recommended to his Apostles the alluring people by them. And if Ministers diligently mind their business, they will have no reason to fear their being despis'd by the common people. Lazy slothful men may think it worth while to use these arts to gain popular applause; but other Ministers may, indeed, well be asham'd of them; especially they who continually boast of antiquity, since an old Council has decreed: "That a Bishop should have cheap or ordinary furniture, "and keep a poor table, and maintain the authority be- "longing to his dignity by his faith, and a good life." * And again: "That a Clergyman should shew his "profession both by his Habit, and his gate, and there- "fore should not endeavour to be fine in his cloaths or his "shoes." † Dr. *N.* does more than once appeal to this same Council, and therefore he ought not to reject their authority.

But he goes on: *The Surplice, which is indeed to be worn by officiating Ministers, cannot justly be the subject of so much clamour and contention. For would these querulous men have Ministers appear at the Prayers and Sacraments, in the same dress as they go about their common affairs in?* We do not think any modest decent garb is *profane*. If our Adversaries say (as our Author here does) the ordinary Habit of Ministers is *very profane*, we see no reason why it should not be lawful to use such a profane Habit. Truly the Apostles and Ministers of the primitive Church, perform'd the sacred offices in the same dress, in which they *went about the streets*. Under the Old Testament indeed, holy garments were prescrib'd by God's command; but under the New we acknowledge no distinction between sacred and profane garments. And if the Gown the Minister uses in the street, is not fit for divine Service, why should not the same be true of his gloves and his shoes, which ordinarily gather more dirt? And if

* Conc. Carth. iv. *c.* 15. † *c.* 45.

if his ordinary garb is not holy enough for him to read the prayers of the Liturgy in, why ſhould it be thought fit for the prayer in the Pulpit before ſermon, and particularly the Lord's Prayer? To attribute an holineſs to Garments, that have really none, is not only idle, but very ſuperſtitious.

Our Adverſaries themſelves dont neglect this: but when they officiate in their congregations, they put on a long black Cloak for the greater diſtinction. Why then ſhould they quarrel at us for uſing a white Garment?

In uſing a black Cloak, we attribute no holineſs to the form or color of the Garment; nor do we condemn other Garments as profane. It is reckon'd among us a grave and decent habit, and therefore us'd for mourning, when men ſtudiouſly avoid all finery in their dreſs. Nay, the wearing black for mourning, is not only the cuſtom of many foreign nations to this day, but was antiently us'd by the *Jews* and *Romans*. And had *Tertullian* ſaid as much in commendation of the Gown or Surplice, as he has done of the Cloak, our Adverſaries would never have made an end of dunning us with it. But we uſe a Cloak ſometimes for our convenience, as 'tis with leſs trouble put on or off; but preſcribe not to any one the uſe of it. And whereas 'tis ſaid, whether the Miniſter uſes *black or white, the matter is not great:* I have ſhewn the Liturgy ſays the contrary. And ſince our Author himſelf is of opinion, that if *we are reſtrain'd to any particular Garment, it ſhould be of fine white linnen, rather than any thing elſe:* * let us hear what examples he alledges to confirm it.

At our Saviour's tranſfiguration, he himſelf, together with Moſes *and* Elias, *appear'd in bright raiment as white as ſnow. The Angels in their appearances are generally ſaid to have appear'd in white.* Let our Adverſaries then ſtay till they become as the Angels, and appear in glory; and in the mean while be content with a leſs honorable garb, like that which our Saviour ordinarily wore, while he was here on earth. Further, ſuppoſing all that our Author ſays to be true; tho' of *Moſes* and *Elias* 'tis only ſaid they appear'd in glory; do then *Chriſt*, *Moſes*, *Elias*, and the Angels ſeem to have appear'd in white for this end, that they might teach us in what color'd Garment a Miniſter ſhould perform divine offices

* *page* 290.

offices in the assembly? If so, why should not the same color be most fit for the whole congregation? They appear'd with a great brightness, that they might give some illustrious tokens of their presence, and command the more reverence. But what is this to Gospel worship, which is a very plain thing, and a stranger to all such pomp and magnificence? And if our Clergymen must appear cloathed after the manner of our Saviour, when he was transfigur'd and glorify'd; why do they not use some art to make their countenances shine? Why are they not *girt about the paps with a golden girdle*? for so Christ appeared to *John*. * Certainly it has been a prejudice to the Church, that the Clergy have chosen to imitate our Saviour rather as shining in glory, than as he liv'd humble and mean in the world.

Our Author likewise alledges *the Elders in the Revelation*. But if there is any force in this argument, the Papists may likewise by it defend their use of incense. But I refer our Adversaries to their own writers, Mr. *Mede*, Mr. *Whiston*, &c. who shew that *Jerusalem* is the scene of that vision, and that all the emblems and figures, made use of in it, are taken from the *Jewish* worship. And if any thing could be concluded from this example, what a strange kind of Christian worship should we soon have, adorn'd with an ark, with harps and trumpets? The Doctor therefore has very little help'd his cause by the Scripture. Now then he attacks us with another argument, and endeavours to overthrow our cause by our own concessions.

Let it be used by Jews, Pagans, Papists, men of all nations, and all religions; is not this common consent the voice of nature, telling us that those who minister in holy things should be thus put in mind of that sanctity and pureness of life, which becomes their function; especially since the Spirit of God has approv'd them as proper emblems of this? †

But what have we to do with the childish worship of the *Jews*, or the superstition of the *Egyptians*, and Papists? Surely they who desire to be accounted Christians, and Protestants, should lay aside all such things. Christ left his religion free from all these trifles: by what right then are they commanded by men? Such *doctrines* and *com-*

* Rev. i. 13. † *page 291.*

what Garments were requiſite in Chriſtian worſhip. " That there are holy and ſpiritual Garments, the Apoſtle " teaches us, when he ſays: *Put ye on the Lord Jeſus* " *Chriſt*. And in another place: *Put on bowels of mercy*, " *goodneſs*, *humility*, *meekneſs*, *and patience*, &c." But what difference is here made between the *Habit in the miniſtry*, and that in common uſe? According to *Jerom*'s opinion, it ſignifies nothing in what habit a good man worſhips God, ſo it be but clean and decent, as he hints a little before. By which we learn, " we ought not to " go into the Holy of Holies with the dirty cloaths, which " we wear every day, in our ordinary buſineſs; but that " we ſhould take the Lord's ſacraments with a pure " conſcience, and clean Garments.

Another place of *Jerom* is alledg'd, which might ſeem more to the purpoſe. * That we may the better underſtand it, we muſt obſerve that the opinion of *Pelagius*, which *Jerom* undertakes to refute, was, that the glory of cloaths, and ornaments, was diſpleaſing to God. Wherein he had no regard to any religious ceremonies, but only to the finery of the cloaths, which people ordinarily wore. Now *Jerom* thus anſwers him: " *What offence is it, I beſeech* " *you, againſt God*, if I have a *fine* [or clean, *mundiorem*] " coat? *If a Biſhop, Presbyter, Deacon, or any of the* " [other] *eccleſiaſtical orders, wear a white Robe, at the per-* " *formance of the ſacred offices*? Have a care, O ye Clergy, " Monks, widows, and virgins; you are in danger of " ſinning, unleſs the people ſee you in *dirty and ragged* " cloaths. I ſay nothing of the Laity, who, according to " him, openly declare war and enmity againſt God, if " they uſe coſtly and gay cloaths." I have ſet down the paſſage a little more fully than our Author has done. The only thing here that would incline one to ſuſpect this linnen Garment was us'd in *Jerom*'s time, is the mention he makes of *candida veſtis*, which is tranſlated *a white robe*, but which ſignifies no more than *a fine garment*. That the word *candidus* has this ſignification, I have evidenced by ſufficient teſtimonies; for which they, who underſtand *Latin*, may conſult the *Latin* edition, *page* 359. And ſince all thoſe epithets, *clean*, *fine*, *coſtly*, *and gay*, which are oppos'd to *Pelagius*'s opinion, who condemn'd the glory of cloaths and ornaments in general, ſignify the ſame

* Lib. i. adv. Pelag.

ſame thing in *Jerom*; and ſince he does not ſpeak of a black, but of a *dirty and ragged* garment, in oppoſition to this *veſtis candida*; I think *Jerom* is manifeſtly to be thus explain'd: "What offence, I beſeech you, is it againſt "God, if a Biſhop, Presbyter, *&c.* at the adminiſtration "of the Sacrament, ſhould wear a fine Garment?" Not that they actually did ſo; but he asks, what hurt there were in it, ſuppoſing they ſhould?

The like anſwer may ſerve to his laſt authority, from *Greg. Naz. Inſom. de Anaſtas. templo*; as I have ſhewn in the *Latin* edition.

Now, I will prove, that the orthodox Clergy, in thoſe days, did not uſe white Garments, by a notable ſtory. About that time *Siſinnius*, Biſhop of the *Novatians*, at *Conſtantinople*, affected a magnificence in his garb and manner of living, which is taken notice of by Hiſtorians, as an unuſual thing in a Biſhop. For when (as *Socrates* relates it) * he made a viſit, cloathed in his white Garments, according to his cuſtom, to *Arſacius* Biſhop of the Catholic Church there, one of *Arſacius*'s friends ask'd him this queſtion: "Why he wore a Garment unfit for a Biſhop, "and where he found it written that a Biſhop ſhould "wear white? *Siſinnius* anſwer'd him: I would have you "firſt tell me, where 'tis written that a Biſhop ſhould "wear black? But when he that propos'd the firſt queſ- "tion was at a loſs to anſwer this croſs queſtion, *Siſinnius* "added: You can never ſhew me that a Biſhop ſhould be "cloathed in black; but *Solomon* gives me a direction, "when he ſays: *Let thy Garments be always white.* And "our Saviour, we find in the Goſpel, uſed a white "Garment, and ſhew'd to his Apoſtles *Moſes* and *Elias* "cloath'd in white." This anſwer of *Siſinnius* we dont deny to have been very ſhrewd and ingenious: but however, the ſtory fully proves what we bring it for. Had it been uſual for Biſhops to appear in ſuch a dreſs, as our Author pretends, when he talks of *Cyprian*, what occaſion could there have been to find fault with *Siſinnius* for it? Nay, had it been then uſed in performing ſacred offices, it is not to be thought, *Siſinnius* in his anſwer would have omitted to mention it. The ſame ſtory is related by *Sozomen*, *Lib.* viii. *c.* 1.

Our Author is miſtaken, in thinking the vain opinion of men, who uſe white ſometimes to ſignify purity of life; or the cuſtom of ſome nations, who wear it *in mourning*, *be-*

* *Lib.* vi *c.* 22.

cauſe expreſſive of the paleneſs of Death; will ſerve to defend the uſe of the Surplice, becauſe that alſo *may properly denote ſanctity of life.* * For, who does not ſee the diſparity of theſe things? We diſpute about a ſacred, and not a civil uſe of garments. Nor are *brides* among us ever dreſt in that manner, upon any ſuch account as he mentions, that ever I heard of; nor could they go to be married in ſuch a garb, without being derided in the ſtreets. But if we may but worſhip God with thoſe rites only which he has preſcrib'd, we are not much concern'd about others, that are uſed out of worſhip.

But who can forbear wondering, our Author ſhould be ſo angry at our ſaying, they make the Surplice ſignify purity of life? The reaſon he brings, is, becauſe (if we may believe him) *there is not in any public act of the Church, one word of any purity of life ſignify'd by it.* † And that you may ſee he is not a little mov'd, he adds: *To object this as a crime to the Church, which ſhe never once mentions, looks not ſo like the accuſation of a fair Adverſary, as the ſpiteful outrage of a harden'd forehead, and intemperate tongue.* But by his leave, if this ceremony be "apt to ſtir up the dull mind of man, to "the remembrance of his duty to God by ſome notable "and ſpecial ſignification, whereby he might be edify'd;" as the Church declares of her ceremonies in general; what can the *notable and ſpecial ſignification* of this ceremony be, if it does not ſignify purity of life? And further, how is it the *outrage of a harden'd forehead and intemperate tongue*, to charge a man with believing, that which he himſelf ſays may be *defended by the authority of the Holy Spirit*? Wherefore, ſince Dr. *N.* and other Clergymen, not only acknowledge this ſignification of the Surplice, but endeavour to prove it by the Holy Scriptures; they have no reaſon to take this accuſation ſo heinouſly, if the Church did not (as ſhe really does) mention it. It has always ſeem'd ſtrange to me, our Adverſaries ſhould eſteem the Papiſts idolaters, and yet be ſo fond of their ſuperſtitious garb. Surely *Tertullian* was of quite another mind, when he ſaid: "If it "be unlawful to ſit in an Idol's temple, what is it to be "ſeen in his habit? What communion is there between "Chriſt and *Belial*? And therefore flee from idolatry." ‖ And in another place: "No one can appear clean in un-

"clean

* page 292. † page 293. ‖ De Coron. c. 10.

" clean garments. If you put on a filthy garment, that " may not perhaps be defil'd by you; but you can't be " clean by reaſon of it." *

CHAP. IX.

Of the Ring in Marriage.

I Shall diſpatch this matter in a few words. We think the eſſence of marriage lies in the mutual compact between a man and woman, whereby they bind themſelves to an indiſſoluble ſociety, as long as they both live. The rites and ceremonies of marriage, we judge, are purely civil; and ſo 'tis the magiſtrate's part to appoint them. For is is very much to the advantage of the commonwealth, that the contract ſhould be public, that ſo the breaking of it may be the better prevented. And therefore let the magiſtrate preſcribe whatever civil and decent rites he will, to teſtify and declare the marriage, ſubjects are bound to comply with them. And as the giving a Ring in marriage is a civil rite, and not unlawful in itſelf, all perſons are oblig'd to uſe it, ſo long as 'tis preſcrib'd. We need not therefore trouble ourſelves much about our Author's arguments. The only thing here in queſtion is: Whether it would not be much more adviſeable in a Proteſtant country to abrogate this rite, or at leaſt to alter ſome things in it, that ſo no one ſhould need to ſcruple it? The Papiſts reckon matrimony a Sacrament. And in *England* they only are counted the fit miniſters of it, who uſe to adminiſter the Sacraments; and a Popiſh rite is retain'd in the moſt ſolemn part of marriage, being us'd with the ſame words which are recited in one of the Sacraments. For theſe are the words in the Liturgy: " Then ſhall they again looſe " their hands, and the man ſhall give unto the woman a " Ring, laying the ſame upon the book, with the accuſtom'd " duty to the Prieſt and Clerk. And the Prieſt taking the " Ring, ſhall deliver it unto the man, to put it on the " fourth finger of the woman's left hand. And the man " holding the Ring there, and taught by the Prieſt, ſhall " ſay: With this Ring I thee wed, with my body I thee

* De Idol. c. 19.

" worſhip, and with all my worldly goods I thee endow, " *in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy* " *Ghoſt.*" Now I appeal to all impartial judges, who are moſt to blame; our ſide, who have deſir'd the government to alter this; or our Adverſaries, who have oppos'd us herein?

But our Author alledges *Tertullian*, as a defender of this rite. * And truly a man can hardly be in his ſenſes, who diſapproves of *Tertullian*'s judgment; that the ceremonies of the Heathen, which are defil'd with no ſuperſtition, may lawfully be us'd by Chriſtians in civil matters. But every one knows, he much diſlik'd all their ſuperſtitious rites, as appears by his Treatiſe *De Corona*. But that we may be the more certain of his judgment, I will ſet down the place our Author refers to, a little more fully than he has done: " Let them ſet up lights that have no light " themſelves. Let them place at their doors lawrels, which " are afterwards to be burnt, for whom fire is prepar'd in " the other world; the ſigns of darkneſs, and the preſages " of puniſhment may well belong to them. Thou art the " light of the world, and a tree always green. If thou " haſt renounc'd their temples, dont make a temple of " thy own door. Nay which is more, if thou haſt re- " nounc'd thoſe whore-houſes [idolatrous temples] dont " make thy own houſe look like a new one." † What could be ſaid better, or more agreeable to our opinion? But he goes on: " As to the ceremonies of private and " ordinary ſolemnities, as the plain Gown which young " men wore, Eſpouſals, Marriages, and giving Names, I " dont ſuppoſe there is any danger from the idolatry which " they practiſe upon thoſe occaſions. For the reaſons are " to be conſider'd, for which any thing is done; and thoſe " I think are innocent of themſelves: becauſe neither " mens peculiar garb, *nor the Ring, nor matrimony, is deriv'd* " *from the worſhip of any Idol.*" Theſe laſt words in *Italic* are what our Author cites.

Another advocate for the Ring is *Auſtin*; who we are told calls the Ring, the *ſponſi pignus*, the *bridegroom's pledge*; and *arrha ſponſalis*, the *betrothing pledge*. *Aug. Serm.* [de tempore] CLXXIX. This Sermon is attributed to *Fulgentius*, and is XLVIII among his works; but, according to the Critics,

* *page* 295. † De Idolat. *c.* 15.

Critics, is neither his nor *Austin*'s. Whoever was the author, he says nothing of the Ring in marriage, but alludes to a chain. He does not call this *sponsi pignus*, for *sponsi* belongs to *filii*. "*Gradiuntur cum domino filii sponsi, pignus ac-*" *cepturi Spiritus Sancti*, i. e. The Apostles, the children of " the bridegroom, go along with their Lord, being about " to receive the pledge of the Holy Spirit. He [that is, " Christ, *Luke* xxiv. 50.] lift up his hands, and bless'd " them, he gave them the precious pledge of the marriage " gift, a chain not adorn'd with gold and jewels, but made " up of the links of charity; being bound with which " they might follow him to the Lamb's wife, to *Jerusalem*, " their everlasting country."

As to those words, *with my body I thee worship*, they are differently understood. Mr. *Selden* interprets them: *I give thee my body.** But perhaps our Author's sense of them may not be amiss: for the *English* verb, *to worship*, is us'd with reference not only to God, but to men. Thus 1 *Chron.* xxix. 20. *All the congregation bowed down their heads, and* worshiped *the* Lord *and the* King. And so the substantive, *worship*, is once used by our interpreters: *Luke* xiv. 10. *Then shalt thou have* worship. But this sense both of the *verb* and the *noun*, is very much out of use, and hardly taken notice of by the common people; tho' we still retain it in some *nouns*, as, *your worship*, and *worshipful*. But methinks however the Churchmen reckon antiquity their glory in other things; yet in a Liturgy written not for the Clergy alone, but for the people, words that are commonly us'd and easy to be understood, should be prefer'd to those that are antient and obsolete.

CHAP. X.

Of Kneeling at the Sacrament.

THis controversy arises from the Rubric in the Liturgy, thus expresst: " Then shall the Minister first receive " the Communion in both kinds himself, and then proceed " to deliver the same to the Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, " [if

* Ux. Heb. *lib.* ii. *c.* 27.

" [if any be preſent] and after that to the people alſo in " order, into their hands, all meekly Kneeling." There are therefore three things here in debate.

1. Whether this poſture be fit and proper in receiving the Sacrament?

2. Whether our Adverſaries have a power to impoſe it upon all? And whether it be lawful for a Miniſter to refuſe the Holy Communion to all thoſe, who ſcruple the poſture, as unlawful on that occaſion?

3. What was the cuſtom of the antient Church?

Dr. *N.* in the firſt place tells us: *The Goſpel has no where preſcrib'd our geſture at the Lord's Supper.** And we acknowledge, it has not any where, in ſo many expreſs words, commanded it. But why ſhould not an argument drawn from Chriſt's own, and his Apoſtles example, be thought by our Adverſaries ſufficient? If the poſture they us'd be not neceſſary, yet what ſhould hinder its being thought lawful? By what right then is it forbidden, as tho' it were unlawful? If our Adverſaries dont ſo much like it themſelves; yet certainly there is no equity in their denying thoſe their liberty, who are of another mind. Shall it be thought enough to confirm their uſages, if they can find, even in ſome later ages, any cuſtoms a little like them; and ſhall it not be lawful for us to follow the example of Chriſt and his Apoſtles? After this rate, we muſt not ſo much propoſe to ourſelves, for our imitation, our Saviour and his Apoſtles, as the Chriſtians who liv'd in after times; and we muſt lay a greater ſtreſs upon the authority of the latter, than the cuſtom of the former.

But, if we may take our Author's word, this whole matter is *left free to the governors of the Church to order it as they pleaſe.* But how do they know, Chriſt has left it to the governors of the Church to make a law about this, which he would not by any law determine himſelf; and to make ſuch a law as ſhould be directly contrary to his own practice? When he ſent out his Apoſtles, he order'd them to *teach men to obſerve all things, whatſoever he had commanded them.* † Why then ſhould men impertinently obtrude, not Chriſt's, but their own laws upon us? Dare they affirm, their own prudence, or care of the Church, is greater than Chriſt's? Our Author therefore had no ground to ſay, Chriſt

* *Pag.* 298. † Matth. xxviii. 20.

Christ has *left this wholly to the governors of the Church*; namely, to make laws in doubtful cases, after their own pleasure. Let us suppose some persons are (as they really are) in doubt, whether it be lawful to receive the Sacrament Kneeling: What will the consequence be, if this posture is requir'd of all communicants? Truly, they who are thus doubtful, must either wrong their own consciences by communicating, or they must withdraw from the communion of those that make such a law. But now since there can be no pretence of any necessity of making such a law; and since there is no controversy about the other posture, wherein these people desire to be left at their liberty; 'tis evident such a law is not for the edification, but the destruction of the Church. So that the governors of the Church cannot rightfully make any such law; because 'tis contrary to the end and design of that power which is lodg'd in them.

But our Author asks: *Why dont our Adversaries tread more exactly in the steps of Christ? 'Tis well known, that when he instituted this Sacrament, he lay along, according to the custom of his country, and all his Disciples lay on beds by him. Why dont they restore this antient and long disused custom, that they may the more religiously conform to the pattern of Christ?* * To this I answer:

1. There is no great difference between our sitting, and their manner of lying. For theirs was a kind of sitting, with a little more leaning of the body than ours. And the difference of these two is so very small, that our Interpreters take no notice of it; but always, as far as I remember, translate the word, whereby their posture is express'd, by *sitting*. And when the Churchmen pourtray Christ giving the Sacrament to his Disciples, they represent him not as lying, but sitting after our fashion. Thus does Bp. *Patrick* in a copper Cut, prefix'd to his *Christian Sacrifice*. But whatever difference there is between our posture, and that which Christ used, 'tis to be ascrib'd not to any religious consideration, but only to our different manner of eating. Wherefore, since our Adversaries endeavour to defend their Kneeling by the antient Christians standing, a posture expressive of adoration; why may not we as well defend our sitting, which is a table posture, by Christ's lying along? Certainly there is not a greater

* *pag.* 299.

greater difference between our posture, and his; than there is between our Adversaries Kneeling, and the antient Christians standing.

2. From the example of Christ and his Apostles, 'tis certain, they did not pretend to a posture of adoration in receiving the Sacrament: And therefore no good reason can be given, why such a one should now be requir'd.

3. The objections of our Adversaries, that sitting is *a too bold and sawcy posture, far from a becoming modesty and humility*, or *a monstrous and abominable impiety*; * are prov'd by the example of Christ and his Apostles, to be impertinent cavillings. For all these things may with as much, nay with more reason, be said of lying along, than of sitting; as any one who will consider the matter, will easily perceive.

4. The reason why our Saviour chose that posture (if we do not mistake it) makes very much to establish our opinion. For he seems to have design'd, that we should at this banquet place ourselves rather after the manner of persons feasting, than of those that are adoring. This was practis'd of old, in the like solemnities, with God's approbation; and our Saviour seems upon that account to have set us his example in this ordinance. I think the *Jews* always sat (I mean in their manner) in all their eucharistical feasts, if we except that one only which they kept in *Egypt*. 'Tis probable they celebrated that feast, which they appointed in honour of *Jehovah*, *Exod.* xxxii. 5. in the same manner they used to do those which he himself had commanded. Now they are thus describ'd keeping it, *v. 6. And they rose up early on the morrow, and offer'd burnt-offerings; and brought peace-offerings; and the people* sat down *to eat and to drink, and rose up to play*. Nay, we find God himself approves this posture in eucharistical feasts; *Ezek.* xliv. 3. 1 *Sam.* xvi. 5. 11. Hence therefore, we say, a table posture is, in the judgment of God himself, proper enough for a feast of thanksgiving. Nor is that custom to be lightly alter'd, which Christ has transmitted from the *Jewish* worship into his own, and has confirm'd by his own example.

Further, our Author demands: *Why we dont reduce the whole number of communicants to twelve*? The acuteness of these men is admirable. They would persuade us, 'tis as indifferent a matter to reduce the communicants to a certain

* *Vid. p.* 100 & 104.

tain number; as 'tis, whether we receive the Lord's Supper in an adoring, or a table posture. And yet the contrary is manifest from the practice of the Church of *England*; for otherwise, why have they not as well made a law for the one, as for the other? Besides, we know from the writings of the Apostles, that no precise number is fix'd. For who is not sensible, the whole Church should partake of the Lord's Supper? But where, I beseech you, has Christ hinted to us, he would not have any Church of his exceed the narrow limits of the number twelve? Does the whole Church of *Corinth*, which used to come together into one place to eat the Lord's Supper, seem to our Adversaries to have been of no larger extent, than this? I appeal now to all impartial judges, whether these so trifling, foolish arguments, are not a sign our Adversaries want better? And much of the same sort is his next question: *Why we dont celebrate it in the upper room of the house*? To answer which, would be only to abuse the reader's patience. Let us therefore proceed to the rest.

But there is no necessity, why we should be confin'd to receive the Sacrament in the same posture we use at common feasts. * Nor is there any necessity, why you should prescribe that posture alone, which we never read was used by Christ and his Apostles. But he adds his reason: *All things are not decent in the one case, which may be very proper in the other.* Who knows not that? Who ever said, or so much as dream'd the contrary? We dont think all those things are decent in the Sacrament, which are very proper in feasts; but only those which our Saviour had been pleas'd to take out of them. Dr. *N.* therefore does but lose his labour, while he endeavours to shew us, wherein the Eucharist differs from a feast. Nor is what he infers from thence much to his purpose: *Now since these customs at other feasts are not admitted here, why may not sitting, for the same reason be changed, as too bold and sawcy a posture, far from a becoming humility and modesty, when we are so immediately in the presence of God*? Say you so? Do you think the *posture* the Apostles used, with our Saviour's approbation, was *too bold and sawcy*, or *not sufficiently humble and modest*? Dont you see whom you injure by those reproaches? truly, not so much the Dissenters, as the Apostles, and our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ himself.

Just

* *page* 100.

Juſt like this is what he ſays, when he calls ſitting *a monſtrous and abominable impiety:* * And when he asks, as he thinks, wittily; but, as I think, ſawcily, not to ſay wickedly: Whether we ſhould ſit ſtill *like unthinking wretches, as if we were thinking of ſomething elſe, or as if we had too mean an opinion of the ordinance to riſe up to it?* † But ſince theſe things ſtrike at the Maſter himſelf, it becomes us, his Diſciples, to bear them patiently. Further, there is not the ſame reaſon for the other circumſtances of a feaſt, mention'd by our Author. For thoſe cuſtoms which he ſays are *caſt out* of the Sacrament, were really never *admitted* into it, as the Tranſlator has expreſs'd it; nor does the leaſt ſign of them appear in the firſt inſtitution; and therefore they are deſervedly kept out of it: but the poſture in receiving it is as old as the inſtitution itſelf. Nor muſt that be as lightly rejected, wherein Chriſt has been pleas'd to ſet us an example, as that wherein we have him not for a pattern. Nor does *the immediate preſence of God* deter us from imitating our Saviour in this matter: ſince his preſence was as immediate, when our Lord ſat at the table. The *Jews* alſo celebrated their euchariſtical feaſts ſitting, *in the immediate preſence of God.* For they eat *before the Lord, Deut.* xii. 7. 18. xv. 20, &c. God at the ſame time giving them to partake of a part of thoſe things which were his, as being firſt offer'd to him. Theſe *Jewiſh* ſolemnities were (as our Author calls the Lord's Supper) *the ſacred pledges of divine mercy*; ‖ nay, and of the communion and friendſhip there was between God and his people.

Hitherto we have found our Author very angry with us, for our celebrating the Lord's Supper after the manner of a feaſt. But now he changes his mind on a ſudden, and commends his own ſide, becauſe they, as much as we, imitate the cuſtom of thoſe who are feaſting; and, not very conſiſtently, makes that to be a matter of praiſe and honour in them, which juſt now was a great fault in us. Thus he diſcourſes: *But our Adverſaries themſelves, by their poſture of ſitting, no more repreſent a feaſt than we do by Kneeling.* But with his good leave, ſince ſitting has been the received poſture in all feaſts ſacred and prophane, and we read not of Kneeling's being uſed in either; in this reſpect we certainly come neareſt to the manner of a feaſt. Nor can he ſtrengthen

* *pag.* 304 † *p.* 303. ‖ *Ibid.*

ſtrengthen his argument by what he adds: *For they dont place themſelves round about a table, with their ſervants at their backs*; * What's this to the purpoſe, ſince neither do ſervants ſtand at the backs of thoſe that kneel? *but ſit diſpers'd about their Meeting-houſe, as at other times; and the elements are brought to them by ſome principal man of the congregation, while they ſit and look about them more like ſpectators than gueſts. But we come and kneel down about the holy table, and the elements are adminiſtred to us by the hands of the Prieſts and Deacons; and ſo we have the reſemblance of a feaſt, tho' a very ſacred and venerable one, full of the higheſt devotion and piety.* When Chriſt firſt gave the Sacrament to his Apoſtles, they could all conveniently enough ſit together at one table. But what courſe they took afterwards, when the number of communicants was increas'd; whether they uſed to come to the table one after another; or whether the elements were carried to them, being at a diſtance from the table; this, I ſay, is altogether uncertain: and therefore I would never contend with any man about it. This, however, I think is certain, that it was not antiently eſteem'd abſolutely neceſſary that perſons ſhould come to the table. *Juſtin Martyr* tells us, the Deacons uſed to give the elements to every one preſent, and carry them to thoſe that were abſent. † Since then he ſays nothing of the people's coming to the table, and tells us, thoſe who were abſent, and could not come to the table, uſed yet to receive; 'tis not probable the cuſtom then obtain'd, which our Author ſo much commends: And if they had us'd all to come to the table, he that adminiſtred might have deliver'd the elements to ſome at leaſt, if not to all the communicants, without the Deacons aſſiſtance; as we ſee it practis'd in the Church of *England*. I take it alſo to be uncertain, whether Chriſt deliver'd the elements himſelf into the hands of each of the Apoſtles; or whether he gave them to him that ſat next to him, to be handed round from one to another. In this we take different ways, without quarrelling with one another. But the cuſtom our Author diſapproves, was not long ſince receiv'd in his own Church, or at leaſt not forbidden; as appears by the words of the Synod of 1640. "We judge it fit and convenient------that all "communicants, with all humble reverence, ſhall draw "near

* *pag.* 301. † Apol. II.

" near and approach to the holy table, there to receive the " divine myſteries, which *have heretofore in ſome places been* " *unfitly carried up and down by the Miniſter*; unleſs it ſhall be " otherwiſe appointed in reſpect of the incapacity of the " place, or other inconvenience, by the Biſhop himſelf " in his juriſdiction, or other Ordinaries reſpectively in " theirs." * And to ſpeak the truth, in many of our aſſemblies the communicants could not come all to the table, one after another, without a great inconvenience. But even in the Church of *England*, no one comes to the table, but the Miniſter. Our Churchmen, dreaming of I know not what holineſs in the table itſelf, incloſe it with rails at about ſix foot diſtance; and ſo the vile Laity come but to the rails, being thought unworthy to come to the table, tho' they are counted worthy to receive the elements. This baſe kind of ſuperſtition our Lord reprov'd of old in the *Phariſees*, *Matth.* xxiii. 16, 17, 18, 19. But how, I beſeech you, do theſe things, as our Author pretends, ſuit a feaſt? who ever knew the gueſts at a feaſt kept off from the table, by rails ſet round about it? Surely this no more expreſſes the reſemblance of a feaſt, than the poſture they uſe. As to the nature of this Sacrament, we have the ſame notion with our Adverſaries; and our Author is unjuſt in going to faſten another upon us. I therefore think it needleſs to ſay any thing of the two next Sections, till he comes to theſe words:

Indeed the Socinians, who own nothing in this Sacrament but a commemoration, do, agreeably enough to their principles, ſit at the receiving of it: but for our Adverſaries to imitate theſe men, whoſe opinions in other things they deteſt, ſhews a genius not diſpos'd to weigh things impartially, but precipitate and prejudic'd in favour of a party, and not apt to conſult the common intereſt of Chriſtianity. † We fear not to call this an odious calumny, ſince we herein imitate the cuſtom of Chriſt and his Apoſtles, and not the *Socinians*. But 'tis a ſhame for a man to be chargeable with the fault he reproves in others. See how very eaſily his argument may be retorted upon himſelf and his party. The Papiſts indeed, who think the bread and wine in the Sacrament are chang'd into the very body and blood of Chriſt, *do, agreeably enough to their own principles*, kneel *at the receiving of it: but for our Adverſaries to imitate theſe*

* Can. 7. † *pag.* 302.

these men, whose opinions in other things they detest, shews a genius not dispos'd to weigh things impartially, &c.

But our Author uses another argument, namely, that this is *the fittest gesture for penitents*: and now he describes the Lord's Supper, as tho' it serv'd for nothing else but to promote repentance. But we say, that posture does not well suit an eucharistical, or thanksgiving feast; and we pay more deference to the approbation of God under the Old Testament, and the example of Christ under the New, than we do to the judgment of the wisest of men.

But our Author would confirm, or at least illustrate the point by a comparison: *Suppose a traitor has obtain'd a pardon from his prince; and that when he receives it, he should be so far from falling down on his knees to give thanks, that he would not so much as rise up, pretending a great many idle scruples, lest by this expression of respect, he should seem to idolize his prince: who would not judge such a wretch worthy of a thousand deaths? But would any impartial person censure this disrespect to a mortal prince, as a piece of pride not to be endur'd, and not much more resent the affronts offer'd to the majesty and authority of almighty God?* *

But this comparison is not made fairly. He should rather have suppos'd, that the prince had been accustom'd to deliver his pardons to rebels sitting, and had long before declar'd his approbation of that posture in receiving them; and that it was as yet doubtful, whether he lik'd of any other. When the case is thus put, as it ought to be, not only would no body judge him worthy of a single death, but all men would acknowledge he behav'd himself very well. And as soon as it shall be prov'd, that herein *affronts* are *offer'd to the majesty and authority of almighty God*, we will leave this practice. For notwithstanding what he may say to the contrary, we do nothing in this matter out of *pride* and *disrespect*; and if it be but made appear to be more pleasing to God, we will thankfully receive these pledges of our redemption, not only kneeling, but prostrate and rolling in the dust. But he goes on:

Besides, that festival gesture, which our Adversaries so much contend for, was never so much as heard of in the first ages. For the primitive Christians, in veneration of Christ, always receiv'd Kneeling or standing: As for sitting, it was never thought of. †

But what need have we of examples, when those of Christ

* *pag.* 303. † *pag.* 304.

and his Apoſtles are ſo clearly and plainly ſet before us in the Scripture? If the practice of the primitive Chriſtians ſhould be of any authority with us, certainly that of the Apoſtles may well claim the chief authority, if it were only becauſe they were the firſt Chriſtians. Wherefore while they boaſt of ſome later examples, we glory in the practice of the moſt antient of all Chriſtians. Nor will it be amiſs here to take notice, how very dangerous 'tis to allow any authority in theſe matters, to uninſpir'd men, however famous and wiſe they may have been; ſince we ſee, our Adverſaries are ſo prone from thence to reject the authority of Chriſt and his Apoſtles.

If any Heretic had been ſo audacious as to attempt the introducing of it into this part of divine worſhip, the moſt devout perſons had certainly ſtarted back from it, as from a monſtrous and abominable impiety. I neither know what Heretic he means (for I ſuppoſe the Apoſtles were not Heretics in his account) nor whence he has taken this. And ſince he alledges no witneſs of what he ſays, let him anſwer for the truth of it.

But there are very probable reaſons and grounds to imagine, that our poſture of Kneeling was the practice of all antiquity. Many great men have thought Kneeling at the Sacrament was never uſed in the Church before the time of *Honorius* III. or *Gregory* IX. Popes of the 13th Century. I will not now inquire whether it might not be a little older; but our Author's aſſertion is not grounded upon the authority of any one antient writer, nor can it ever be prov'd. If our Adverſaries can pretend antiquity here, there is nothing which they may not with as good reaſon defend by it. But 'tis no new thing for them to attempt to wind that with craft to ſerve their own purpoſes, which they ſee to be moſt directly contrary to them. 'Tis well known from *Juſtin Martyr*'s *Apology*, which I have had ſo frequent occaſion to mention, that Chriſtians uſed to meet and receive the Lord's Supper every Lord's day; but it is certain in the third and following Centuries, they never worſhip'd Kneeling upon thoſe days. Hence 'tis undoubted, that another poſture was then us'd at the Sacrament. Nay, the antients reckon'd that unlawful, which the Churchmen practiſe, as often as they adminiſter the Sacrament on a Lord's day. And yet here too he appeals to antiquity. For thus he argues:

For

For what can be the reason of that antient injunction, when they had daily Sacraments, that they should stand in the congregations all Sundays and weekdays between Easter *and* Whitsuntide, *if Kneeling had not been the practice at other times?* By the same argument it might be prov'd that the primitive Christians kneel'd at the reading of the Scriptures, and the Sermon, as well as the receiving the Sacrament. As to the thing itself, they always pray'd at other times Kneeling; but on Lord's Days, and all the while between *Easter* and *Whitsuntide*, they counted it unlawful to do so. A notable place in the *Apostolical Constitutions* will make this plain: "What "apology will he make to God, who does not assemble on "the Lord's Day, to hear the saving word concerning the "resurrection? on which also we pray thrice, standing, "in memory of him who arose in three days; on which "is the reading the Prophets, the preaching the Gospel, "the offering of the sacrifice, and the gift of the holy "food." * So that when they pray'd to God on the Lord's Days, they, contrary to their custom on other days, stood; but nothing of this nature is said of the Lord's Supper. Thus also the Canon of the Council of *Nice*, alledg'd by our Author, is to be understood: "Because "there are some who kneel on the Lord's Day, and the "time between *Easter* and *Whitsuntide*; to the end, that "all things may be alike observ'd in all places, it seem'd "good to the holy Council that men should pray stand-"ing." †

But the Doctor farther asks: *Why does* Gregory Nazianzen *tell us, his sister* Gorgonia *fell on her Knees before the Altar, if Kneeling at the Sacrament had not been the custom of those days?*

The reason is plain enough: For *Gorgonia* therefore fell on her knees, because she offer'd her prayers to God; and that posture has always been thought the most fit for prayer. And *Nazianzen*'s words shew this was the cause of her Kneeling: "And with a loud voice she call'd upon "him, who is worship'd upon the Altar." ‖ From these words the Papists endeavour to establish the adoration of the elements. And to say the truth, if the holiness of the Altar is so great upon the account of the elements bless'd there, that we ought to worship towards it; I dont see,

* *Lib.* ii. *c.* 59. † Can. 20. ‖ Orat. ii.

why we ſhould not alſo worſhip towards the elements themſelves, which muſt have a greater holineſs. But there is not a word concerning the Sacrament, and ſo neither argument is of any force. But if any one ask, why ſhe kneel'd in the Church, and at the altar rather than any other place? I anſwer: She might perhaps think, her mind would be more excited to prayer in ſo holy a place, or that her ſupplications would there be more prevailing with God. Whether that fancy of hers has any good foundation, or does not rather ſavour of ſuperſtition, I leave to the judgment of others.

Neither is Kneeling at the Sacrament deriv'd (as they pretend) to us from the Papiſts. * If it be not deriv'd to them from the Papiſts, whence then have they receiv'd it? But mind now our Author's pleaſant reaſon for this: *Sitting is in greateſt reputation with them, as well as with our Diſſenters.* What then? becauſe both are us'd by the Papiſts, is it neceſſary that neither, or both of them, muſt have riſen from their cuſtom? If he ſays, that for this reaſon neither of them riſe thence, how will he make good his conſequence? If he ſays both of them are deriv'd from the Papiſts, we will believe him, when he can prove that ſitting had its riſe among the Papiſts, as well as Kneeling. But what is this to our Author's purpoſe, who undertook to prove Kneeling was not a Popiſh rite? Perhaps what comes next may ſeem more pertinent: *When the Pope himſelf communicates, to ſignify his equality with God, he ſits on a throne in great ſtate, as a worthy gueſt at God's table.* Can the reader forbear laughing? Kneeling at the Sacrament is no Popiſh rite; becauſe one Perſon, *the Pope, ſits, when he communicates.* 'Tis not indeed a rite us'd by the Pope himſelf; yet 'tis Popiſh, *i, e.* Papiſtical, preſcrib'd by the Pope, and us'd by that whole communion, the Pope alone excepted. But what Popiſh writer ever gave this account of the matter, that *to ſignify his equality with God, he ſits on a throne*? His own ſins are heavy enough upon him, and there is no need to add more to his load by ſuch falſe calumnies. And if this buſineſs be throughly examin'd, it makes for our cauſe. For tho' the Papiſts are oblig'd to defend Kneeling at the Sacrament, and the adoration of it, for the ſake of their tranſubſtantiation; yet they are not able to deny the Apoſtles receiv'd

* *page* 305.

receiv'd it in a different posture. And for this reason the Pope communicates sitting, *to signify not his equality with God*, but his imitation of the Apostles.* Further, if the reason alledg'd by our Author were true, what could it signify to us? When Christ and his Apostles have taught us any thing by their example, we dont presently think it becomes unlawful, if the Pope of *Rome* practises perhaps the same, for quite another reason, and that a very bad one. We have herein no regard to the Pope. If he has polluted Christ's institutions, let him look to it; we endeavour, as much as we can, to restore them to their antient purity, by removing all the corruptions, which have been mix'd with them. Nor are we so foolish as to think every thing, which he has retain'd in his Church, the Synagogue of Satan, must needs presently be unlawful, and fit to be rejected; for then we must not retain the Sacrament it self, nor even the worshiping a Deity.

CHAP. XI.

Of the observation of Holidays.

CONcerning this matter, I have written somewhat largely, in my Letters in answer to Dr. *Wells*. I shall here therefore borrow some things from them, for the explaining our opinion.

1. We think God has appointed one certain day in the week, for the thankful remembrance of those mercies, which he has in common bestow'd upon us. Upon that therefore, as often as it returns, all Christians are bound to imploy themselves in meditating upon God's works of creation and redemption, in praising God, and in other religious exercises. Hence we judge it needless for men, by their authority, to appoint other days of the same nature; and desire them, who usurp such a power, to produce the commission they have for it.

2. It seems probable to us, that God would not have us observe these yearly Holidays; because we meet with nothing in his word, whereby we can fix the times of the year, when those things happen'd, which our

* *Vid.* Alex. Hales de Missa *Par.* ii. *quæst.* 12. *p.* 4.

Adversaries pretend are the occasion of them. There are but four of them which we can assign to their proper season; and they are *Easter*, *Whitsuntide*, *Good friday*, and *Ascension day*. But the Scriptures tell us the exact times of all these: not that we should yearly observe them, but for other reasons, easy enough to be perceiv'd, but too long to be related. Concerning two of these, we have no great dispute; for they always fall on Lord's Days, which are holy by God's appointment. And it seems ridiculous and superstitious, that men should endeavour by their orders to make these more holy than the rest, since all Lord's Days are by divine institution equal in that respect. As to the other Holidays, they cannot by any arguments be prov'd to be plac'd on those days, whereon the pretended occasions of them really happen'd. Nay, the great *Scaliger*, and many other learned men, have demonstrated the weakness and falsity of those reasons by which five of them are fix'd, *viz.* The *Annunciation* of the B. V. *Mary*; the *Nativity* of St. *John* Baptist; the *Nativity*, and the *Circumcision* of Christ; and the *Purification* of the B. V. *Mary*. For they who settled the Calendar as it now is, went upon a double grievous mistake, as all now own it to have been; that *Zacharias*, the Baptist's Father, was High-priest, and that the time when he was executing his office, * was the great day of atonement, spoken of *Lev.* xxiii. 23, *&c.* And now, since these things are so, who, that has any regard to truth, can say in his prayers on *Christmas day*: "Almighty "God, who hast given us thy only begotten Son to take "our nature upon him, and *as at this time* to be born of a "pure Virgin, *&c.*" And on the *Purification day*: "Almighty "and everlasting God, we humbly beseech thy Majesty, "that as thy only begotten Son was *this day* presented in "the temple, in substance of our flesh; so we, *&c.*" Who, I say, when he is speaking to the great God, in the most sacred duty of prayer, before the congregation, would dare to utter such false things? Nay, who would not refuse to subscribe to this, as all who are ordain'd by the Bishops are requir'd to do?

3. We dislike the reason, upon which these Holidays were at first brought in, and the effects which they have since produc'd. We never find in the Old or New Testament,

* Luke i. 8.

Teſtament, any days appointed to be kept in commemoration of the Saints. And therefore our Adverſaries have here neither Scripture precept, nor example, for what they do.

I have before taken notice, there was antiently a very miſchievous deſign to adapt the Chriſtian religion to the rites and cuſtoms of the Heathens. This was the beginning of many feſtivals, while the Chriſtians endeavour'd by this means to draw off the Pagans from their ſuperſtition. Hence they fix'd their principal Holidays in thoſe times of the year, which were before obſerv'd among the Gentiles, with the greateſt ſolemnity. This has been lately obſerv'd by Mr. *Whiſton*, * and long before by Mr. *Iſ. Caſaubon*. † But no one has more fully prov'd it from the writings of the antients, than Mr. *Joſeph Mede*, in his excellent Treatiſe of *The Apoſtacy of the latter times*. ‖ Where he ſhews at large, in what manner *the doctrine of Devils*, 1 *Tim.* iii. 1. that is, as he explains it, the worſhiping of *Demons*, or *Saints*, was brought into the Church; and cites, among many other teſtimonies, theſe remarkable words of *Theodorit*: "Our "Lord God hath brought his dead [*viz.* the *Martyrs*] into "the room and place [*the temples*] of your Gods, whom he "hath ſent packing, and hath given their honor to his "Martyrs. For inſtead of the feaſts of *Jupiter* and *Bacchus*, "are now celebrated the feſtivals of *Peter* and *Paul*, and "*Thomas* and *Sergius*, &c. and other holy Martyrs." ‡ We have therefore good reaſon not to keep theſe feaſts, which had a bad beginning, and were afterwards ſo pernicious to religion. Nor is there the leaſt ſign of any feſtival obſerv'd in the three firſt Centuries, in memory of the Apoſtles, of Chriſt's birth, or ſhewing to the *Gentiles*. Nay, *Juſtin Martyr* mentions no other Holiday, but the Lord's Day. * And when *Trypho* the *Jew* objected, that the Chriſtians did not keep ſabbaths, or feaſts, he does not anſwer him, according to the ſentiments of our Churchmen; that they rejected indeed the *Jewiſh* ſabbaths and feſtivals, while they kept others in memory of the Apoſtles; but he argues only, that they had good reaſon to obſerve the firſt day of the week. †

* Harmon. of the Goſpel, *p.* 162. † Exercit. 1. in Baron. *ſect.* 25.
‖ Inter Opera, *p.* 642. ‡ De cur. Gr. Affect. *lib.* viii. * Apol. ii.
† Dial. *p.* 38, 47, 49.

4. We own, there may happen new occasions of solemn and public fasting, or rejoicing; for which, because they concern the civil state, 'tis the business of the magistrate to appoint proper days and times. And he only can command all his subjects to observe such fasts, or thanksgivings, when there is occasion for them. But if he neglects his duty, and does not appoint such days, when 'tis manifest to all that he ought; or if abusing his power, he orders days to be kept to a bad purpose; we think every Church has a right to set apart days themselves, or to forbear to observe them that are not well injoin'd. We are to judge, when these more solemn occasions are proper to be kept; not by those things which concern all Christians in common, and at all times, for which a sufficient provision is made by God himself in the institution of the Lord's Day; but by a careful observation of the providence of God towards the Church, or state. I will make the thing plain by mentioning some instances. The Churchmen are commanded to keep the yearly fast of *Lent*. If you ask the reason, they tell you 'tis, that all may repent of their sins, as they have all sin'd. But now, tho' we deny not, that we have all sin'd, and that sin is a just cause of fasting; yet since our Saviour knew this as perfectly as they can do, why should not this continue, as it was by him left to mens liberty? Our Adversaries alledge nothing new, that has happen'd since he declar'd his mind about fasting, that should give any occasion to this alteration. But if the sins of a people are at any time become very heinous, if God by his providence testifies his displeasure, or if any thing extraordinary is to be sought with more fervent prayers, these are new and special occasions, wherein God calls us to public fasting; and 'tis manifest to all, that a day should be appointed for it: whereas nothing of this nature can be said of the Lent fast. Thus on the other hand, since God has commanded every first day of the week to be kept holy, that we may apply ourselves to the praising him as our creator, and especially as our redeemer; the blessing God for the incarnation, death, resurrection, and ascension of Christ, and what ever else he has done to bring about our redemption, is the chief business of the Lord's Day. By what authority then do officious men set apart other days yearly for the same end? Whenever God vouchsafes to bestow any new and eminent blessing upon us, we own this calls for more solemn thanksgivings; but those

that;

that equally belong to all Christians, in every age, need no stated solemn festival, beside that weekly one which God has appointed. I would therefore fain have our Adversaries shew us, what new occasions of instituting the festivals of our Saviour, his Apostles, and the Virgin *Mary*, have happen'd since the appointment of the religious observation of the Lord's Day.

Hence 'tis evident, what our Author says of the fasts prescrib'd by *Jehoshaphat*, *Josiah*, *Ezra*, and *Esther*, are nothing to the purpose. * For we hold that fasts should at all times be appointed by the Magistrate, as there is occasion. Let us therefore proceed to his other examples:

The feast of Purim *was establish'd for a perpetual anniversary of thanksgiving to God, for delivering the* Jews *from the bloody massacre, which* Haman *had projected against them.* That this instance signifies nothing in our controversy, is prov'd by two considerations: First, God seems to have appointed, or at least by some certain tokens to have approv'd of this feast. For if the Book of *Esther* be canonical, as the Churchmen agree with us it is, † inspiration was not ceas'd among the *Jews*, when that feast was instituted. Secondly, If that feast took its rise not from any special divine precept, but from the appointment of the *Jews*; yet it no way agrees with our case, because there was a new and special occasion for it. But if our Adversaries would not lose their labour, let them shew us, that the *Jews* ever instituted anniversary solemnities, in remembrance of those blessings, for the thankful acknowledgment of which a particular day had been before set apart by God's commandment; nay, or of those blessings, which tho' they were before the setting apart that particular day, yet were not order'd to be commemorated therein, or in any other festival. Let them for instance tell us, if they can, when the *Jews* appointed an anniversary day in memory of the creation, for which God had sanctify'd the seventh day of the week; or when they instituted a yearly festival to bless God for preserving *Noah* and his sons in the flood, or for calling *Abraham*, &c. The feast of *Purim* was very like our Fifth of *November*, on which we, as well as the Churchmen, bless God for our deliverance from the Gunpowder Plot, and for

* *Page* 302, 303. † Art. vi.

for the happy arrival of our Great Deliverer, *King William*, of bleſſed memory.

The feaſt of Dedication, begun by Judas Maccabeus, *was religiouſly obſerv'd for many ages, and honor'd with our Lord's own preſence.* My ſecond obſervation, with reference to the feaſt of *Purim*, might not amiſs perhaps be apply'd to this of *Dedication*. But to ſay nothing of that, how does it appear, that our Lord had any regard to this feſtival? Our Author had his eye upon thoſe words of the Evangeliſt: *And it was at* Jeruſalem *the feaſt of Dedication, and it was winter. And* Jeſus *walked in the Temple in* Solomon's *Porch.* * But how could our Author tell he had any more regard to the feaſt of Dedication, than he had to the winter? I walk'd it may be in *Paul*'s Church at *London* on a *Chriſtmas day*, muſt I therefore be needs ſaid to have done it upon the account of the feſtival? I am ſorry, I profeſs, learned men ſhould defend a cauſe, that has no better arguments to ſupport it. Let us hear what the learned Dr. *Lightfoot* ſays of this matter. He cites then this paſſage out of the *Hieroſol. Megillah, fol.* 70. 4. "There were eighty "five Elders, above thirty of which were Prophets too, "that made their exceptions againſt the feaſt of *Purim*, "ordain'd by *Eſther* and *Mordecai*, as ſome kind of inno- "vation againſt the law." † Upon which, the Doctor ſubjoins his own obſervation: "And yet that feaſt was but "of two days continuance. 'Tis a wonder then, how "this feaſt of Dedication, the ſolemnity of which was to "be kept up for eight days together, that had no other "foundation of authority, but that of the Scribes, ſhould "be ſo eaſily ſwallow'd by them." And a little after, upon thoſe words of the Evangeliſt: *It was winter, and* Jeſus *walked in* Solomon's *Porch*, he gives us this note: "He "walk'd there, becauſe it was winter, that he might get "and keep himſelf warm: perhaps he choſe *Solomon*'s Porch "to walk in, either that he might have ſomething to do "with the Fathers of the *Sanhedrin* who ſat there; or elſe, "that he might correct and chaſtiſe the buyers and ſel- "lers, who had their ſhops in that place."

It would be tedious to mention all the feſtivals, which the primitive Chriſtians ſet apart in honor of Chriſt, his Apoſtles, and Martyrs.

Beſide

* John x. 22, 23. † His Works, vol. ii. p. 578.

Beſide the Lord's Day, there was no *feſtival ſet apart in honor of Chriſt, or his Apoſtles, in the three firſt ages of the Church*; as I have obſerv'd already. The words of *Clement* of *Alexandria* are very remarkable concerning this matter: "We "are commanded to worſhip and honor this ſame perſon, "who we are perſuaded is the Word, the Saviour, and "Ruler, and thro' him the Father, not upon ſelect days, "as ſome others do; but we do it always, and by all "manner of ways, thro' the whole courſe of our lives." * But tho' the antients kept no days in honor of the Apoſtles, yet we deny not that the feaſts of other Martyrs are very antient. But theſe can do our Adverſaries little ſervice. For the primitive Chriſtians thought the martyrdoms, which happen'd among them after the Lord's Day was inſtituted, gave them new occaſions of keeping feſtivals; but our Adverſaries obſerve no ſuch for their own Martyrs, as *Ridley*, *Hooper*, *Farrer*, *Latimer*, *Cranmer*, &c. nor do they pretend any ſuch reaſon for their Holidays. Nay, thoſe antient feſtivals of the Martyrs, if they were at firſt void of ſuperſtition, yet ſoon degenerated into it; as is certain from *Tertullian*, who mentions the *oblations they uſed in his time to make for the dead, and for their martyrdom on a ſtated day yearly*. We have therefore the more reaſon to take warning by their example, and to watch againſt the firſt beginnings of ſuperſtition. Nor will any one think I ſay this without cauſe, who conſiders with himſelf what Biſhop *Mountagu*, and ſome other famous authors of his time, have written concerning the invocation of the Saints.

But our Author brings an argument againſt us from our own practice. *Will any man ſay that we have not as much power to ſet apart times, as perſons and places, for religious uſes*? So the *Latin* ſhould be render'd. As to *perſons*, they are ſet apart by a divine command; and we think any *time* may be ſo too, if God pleaſes; as is evident by our opinion of the Lord's Day. Let therefore our Adverſaries ſhew, their feſtivals are thus preſcrib'd, and they will put an end to the controverſy about them. As to *places*, we think there is now no holineſs in them, as I have elſewhere ſaid. The reſt of this paragraph is eaſily anſwer'd, from what I have now ſaid; and therefore ſince there is no need to inſiſt upon it, I haſten to other matters.

As

* Stromat. *lib.* vii. *p.* 719.

*As to the number of our feſtivals, which our Adverſaries make ſuch ado about, as if by this means working people were ſtarv'd; if they be reckon'd up, they will not be found more than twenty eight: and they are ſo divided among the ſeveral months, that they come no oftner, than what may well conſiſt with the buſineſs of labouring men, even tho' they ſhould ſtrictly obſerve them.**

This is no fair repreſentation of the caſe. For firſt, our Author is out in his reckoning, ſince they are twenty nine in number. And if we ſhould only conſider the matter thus, the Holidays of human inſtitution, will be above half as many, as thoſe of divine appointment: But to theſe we muſt add two other feſtivals, *viz.* the XXIXth of *May*, and the Vth of *November*. And ſince there is as much reaſon to forbear working on Faſt days, as on thoſe of Thankſgiving, their number ought likewiſe here to be conſider'd. Now the days of faſting or abſtinence in the Church of *England* are all the *Fridays* in the year, except *Chriſtmas day*; all the days in *Lent*, which, beſide the *Fridays*, are thirty three; ſix more in the *Ember weeks*, three *Rogation days*, and the XXXth of *January*. The ſum is XXXI Feaſt days, and XCV Faſting days; to which if we add the LII feſtivals of divine appointment, all the Holidays, Feaſts and Faſts taken together, make CLXXVIII. Let now any reaſonable perſons judge, whether we have not good reaſon to pity the caſe of poor working people? and whether the Fourth Commandment is not deſervedly urg'd by us in the preſent caſe; when not the ſeventh part, but almoſt half our time is to be devoted to the duties of religion? We may well here take up the words, which King *David* with great wiſdom utter'd upon another occaſion: *Let us now fall into the hand of the Lord, for his mercies are great; and let me not fall into the hand of man.* † If the Apoſtle *Peter* call'd the *Jewiſh* ceremonies a *yoke, which neither they, nor their fathers could bear*; ‖ what would he have ſaid of this, which is much heavier? Our Author ſeems to hint, that their feſtivals are not *ſtrictly* obſerv'd; which is indeed very true now, God having in his tender mercies relax'd that part of their diſcipline; yet formerly when they had more power, a man would have been put into the Spiritual Courts, if he went to his work upon a Holiday, after he had been at the Sermon. ‡ But our Author goes on:

Ten

* *Pag.* 308. † 1 Sam. xxiv. 14. ‖ Act. xv 10. ‡ *See* part of a Regiſter, *p.* 36. *comp.* Q. Eliz. Injunct. 20. A. 1559.

Ten of them fall upon the great ſolemnities of Chriſtmas, Eaſter, *and* Whitſuntide; *at which times no body would work, tho' they were not bound to any religious obſervance of thoſe ſeaſons.* And why ſo? Truly I can't perceive, what ſhould make any ſcruple it. *Some of the reſt fall on* Sundays, *on which our Adverſaries do not hold it lawful for any man to work; and for the remainder, they come ſo ſeldom, that there is ſcarce ever above one in a month.* Sometimes more, and ſometimes fewer, fall on a Lord's Day. If we make a computation thro' the whole cycle of the ſun, we ſhall find there are but CVIII of the feſtivals, that fall upon the Lord's Day in all that time; that is not quite four in a year, take one with another; and as many will fall on the *Friday*. If we ſubſtract theſe, there will remain CLXX days in a year ſet apart for religious exerciſes, beſides the Vigils, which I have not regarded in the computation. Let our Brethren then judge, how *good the temper of the Church is.*

Our Author next proceeds to treat of the particular feſtivals of the Church of *England*, and their antiquity.

The feaſt of the Annunciation was eſtabliſh'd in the Church in the days of Athanaſius, *A. D.* 240. *who calls it one of the Dominical feaſts.** *Athanaſius* was not born in the year 240; ſo that I ſuppoſe 'tis falſe printed for 340. I ſhall ſay nothing of the teſtimony, becauſe he has not refer'd us to the place, where 'tis to be found. But I am much out in my gueſs, or he cites ſome ſuppoſititious writing for the true *Athanaſius*.

The feaſt of the Nativity ſeems to have been obſerv'd from the very firſt beginning of Chriſtianity. The moſt antient Fathers mention it as ſuch.

'Tis moſt certain no ſuch feaſt was obſerv'd by the Catholics in the three firſt ages of Chriſtianity: nor can one witneſs be produc'd of any ſuch feaſt before the fourth Century, and that well advanc'd too. The firſt we read of, who obſerv'd any feſtivals in honor of Chriſt, are, if I am not very much miſtaken, the heretical followers of *Baſilides*. I will here tranſcribe a notable paſſage of *Clement* of *Alexandria*; by which it will appear, that thoſe Heretics celebrated the feaſt of Chriſt's Baptiſm, if not alſo of his Nativity, at the right time of the year, as they perſuaded themſelves; and that the Catholics were uncertain of the true

* pag 310

true time of his birth, and kept no Holiday in memory of it. " There are ſome, *ſays he*, who with greater curioſity " fix not only the year, but the day our Saviour was born; " which they ſay was the 28 year of *Auguſtus*, on the " 25 day of the month *Pachon*. The followers of *Baſi-* " *lides* celebrate alſo the day of his Baptiſm, ſpending " the whole night before in reading. They ſay it was " in the 15 year of *Tiberius*, on the 15 day of the " month *Tubi*. Some ſay it was the 11 of that month. " ----Nay, ſome of them ſay, he was born the 24, or " 25 of the month *Pharmuthi*."* But neither the 25 of *Pachon*, nor the 24, or 25 of *Pharmuthi* will fall on the 25 of *December*; as Mr. *Lydyat*, our own famous Chronologer, has ſhown.† The Fathers of the fourth Century imitated *Baſilides*'s followers; for then firſt was the feſtival of Chriſt's Baptiſm inſtituted; that of his Nativity being remov'd from the 6 of *January* to the 25 of *December*; as *Caſaubon* has obſerv'd. " From that time, " *ſays he*, the 6 of *January* retain'd the name of the " *Epiphany*; but they began to give a different reaſon of " the appellation, from what they did before. For that day, " that was before kept as the feaſt of his Nativity, was " then obſerv'd as the day of his Baptiſm, and of the " coming of the Wiſe Men of the *Eaſt*."‖ The Doctor tells us in the *Latin* edition, that *no one mentions its beginning*. What then? muſt it therefore have been *from the very firſt beginning of Chriſtianity*? How many things are there, whoſe beginnings are expreſly mention'd by no body; which yet are much later than that comes to? I can't but think, 'tis plain from what I have ſaid, that it was the contrivance of the fourth Century. And truly *Chryſoſtom* expreſly mentions the beginning of it, that is, when it began to be kept in his Church on the 25 of *December*. But the Doctor goes on:

'*Twas celebrated in the perſecution of* Maximus [there was no ſuch Emperor at that time. Dr. *N.* by *Maxim.* meant *Maximinianus*, tho' he ſhould have rather ſaid *Diocleſian*] *who burnt the Chriſtians in the temple of* Nicomedia, *as they were keeping this feaſt*. Niceph. Hiſt. *lib.* vii. *c.* 6.

But

* Strom. *lib.* 1. *p.* 340. † Emend. Temp. *p* 156. & Can. Chron. *p.* 88.
‖ Exercit. 1. *ſect.* 11.

But what a fine witneſs does he give us of this? A ſorry trifling writer of the 14 Century, of no credit. "This "*Nicephorus*, ſays *Caſaubon*, is a moſt fabulous writer, and "of no judgment; as is well known to the learned, and "I have before obſerv'd. Wherefore, whatever he ſays, "I value it not a ruſh, except there be ſome other autho- "rity for it. How often does *Baronius* himſelf deſpiſe, "reject, and confute him?" * Now *Nicephorus*, as far as appears, is the only author of this fine ſtory. Dr. *Cave* thinks he might perhaps have it from *Simeon Metaphraſtes*. If that be true, he will not deſerve much more credit upon his account; ſince *Simeon*, tho' an antienter writer, is not leſs ſilly and fabulous than himſelf; of which Mr. *Mede* has given us proof enough.† Nay, there are ſufficient evidences, that this ſtory of *Nicephorus* is falſe. For who can believe, that twenty thouſand Chriſtians could at that time meet together in one temple? It does not yet appear, the temples of Chriſtians, during the ten firſt perſecutions, were large enough to contain ſo great a number. And when our Adverſaries find it will be to their purpoſe, they eaſily embrace a contrary opinion; as when from the great number of Chriſtians in a city they argue, the whole Church could not be included in the narrow compaſs of a ſingle congregation. Beſides, as this ſlaughter vaſtly exceeds all that are mention'd by *Euſebius* and *Lactantius*, 'tis incredible that neither of them ſhould ſay a word of it, where they particularly treat of the perſecution at *Nicomedia*, which was alſo the place of *Lactantius*'s abode. Nay, *Euſebius*, after he had given an account of this perſecution at *Nicomedia*, preſently adds: "That the numbers could hardly be "reckon'd up of thoſe Martyrs, who afterwards ſuffer'd in "each Province; and eſpecially in *Africa*, *Mauritania*, *The-* "*bais*, and *Egypt*." ‖ But if twenty thouſand were ſlain together at one time in *Nicomedia*, how could the number of Martyrs be the greateſt in thoſe provinces? For *Euſebius* ſpeaks of it as a monſtrous thing at *Thebais*, one of thoſe provinces: "That ſometimes ten, ſometimes above twen- "ty, ſometimes near theeſcore, and ſometimes an hun- "dred perſons, men with their wives and children, were "ſlain in one day." ‡ Let the reader compare the learned Mr.

* Exercit. 1. *ſect.* 17. † The Apoſtacy of the latter times. ‖ H. E. *lib.* viii. c. 6. ‡ *chap.* 9.

Mr. *Dodwell* discourſing in like manner of *the fewneſs of the Martyrs*;* who takes no notice of this fable, as unworthy to be mention'd, tho' as contrary to his argument as to mine. In the eaſtern Churches, this feſtival of the 25 of *December* came firſt into uſe, in *Chryſoſtom*'s time, as he expreſly teſtifies: "'Tis not, *ſays he*, quite ten years "ago, ſince we were inform'd of this day." † They receiv'd it from thoſe of the weſt, as he afterwards tells us. *Scaliger* writes thus concerning it: "*Chryſoſtom* himſelf tells "us in that Oration, the cuſtom of keeping that day was "brought to *Conſtantinople* by the *Romans*, but ten years be-"fore; and that it had indeed been us'd to be kept for "ſome years by the *Romans*, of whom thoſe of *Conſtanti-"nople* learnt it. All theſe things ſhew the novelty of the "religious obſervation of that day. Among the *Romans* "who began it, I find none more antient than *Ambroſe*, "that aſſign the nativity of our Lord to the 25 of *Decem-"ber*; if you except that pretended *Clement*, who in the "xiii *chap.* of *Book* v. ſpeaks of this, as inſtituted by "the Apoſtles, which was not in uſe till a little before "*Chryſoſtom*'s time." ‖ But I fear a ſuppoſititious *Ambroſe* impos'd upon the great *Scaliger*. He ſeems to refer to the Sermons *De Natali Domini*, which are unjuſtly father'd upon him. *Ambroſe* himſelf, when he is treating of the nativity of our Lord, ſays not a word of it;‡ but whether he does in any other of his genuine works, I cannot certainly ſay.

The feaſt of Circumciſion is not very antient. The firſt that mentions it is Maximus Taurinenſis, *who flouriſh'd* A. D. 450, *if the inſcription of his Homily*, In circumciſione Domini, *may be allow'd to be genuine; for there is nothing upon the ſubject in this Homily.* The true title is: *De Kalendis Januarii Increpatio: A Reproof for them that keep the firſt of January.* For ſo far is *Maximus* from eſteeming it a Chriſtian feſtival, that he blames men for obſerving the day, which many others do beſide him. Hence 'tis plain thoſe words, *In circumciſione Domini*, are not *Maximus*'s.* But at length our Author has found out a true date to this Holiday, namely, the twelfth moſt ſuperſtitious and barbarous Century. For

---

* *Inter* Differt. Cypr. *ſect.* 10 † Hom. in Nat. Dom. ‖ De Emend. Temp. *lib.* vi. *p.* 543. ‡ Comm. in Luk. *chap.* ii. *in init.* * *Vide* Serm. 17. *inter* Ambroſii opera. & Chryſoſt. Hom. cont. eos qui nov. obſerv. *etiam* Can. 16. Conc. Turon. ii. *A.* 567. & Contil. Antiſiod. *A.* 578.

For ſo he adds: *Sr.* Bernard *has Sermons upon it, about* A. D. 1140. *In the next Century we find it in the Councils catalogues of feſtivals.* With good reaſon now, we congratulate our Churchmen upon the diſcovery of *their anceſtors, whoſe cuſtoms they follow.** *Caſaubon* agrees with our Author, and tells us: "They, who five hundred years ago, gave "an account of the feſtivals of the whole year, have "not mention'd this of circumciſion." † And there are few of the Popiſh Holidays that may not be defended by as great antiquity as this. Indeed, if our Adverſaries would imitate the antient Church, they ſhould keep this as a faſt. ‖

But he pretends to have better antiquity for the next feaſt, of *Purification, otherwiſe call'd the Preſentation of Chriſt in the temple*; which, he ſays, *was inſtituted by the Emperor* Juſtinian, *about the year* 542, *if we may believe modern Greek writers*; tho' Chryſoſtom *ſeems to have an Homily upon it.* Every body knows, thoſe modern *Greek* writers uſe to place the beginning of the cuſtoms of their own time in the moſt diſtant ages, to procure them the greater veneration. And I queſtion very much, whether any author can be produc'd, who mentions this feſtival before the ninth Century. As to *Chryſoſtom*'s Homily, here refer'd to, beſides that Sir *Henry Savil* ſuſpected it to be none of his, there is not a word in the whole Homily concerning this feaſt, which is contrary to *Chryſoſtom*'s cuſtom, when he has any Sermon upon ſuch occaſions. And if becauſe he has an Homily upon the meeting of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, and the Bl. Virgin, and *Simeon*, we may conclude that in his time they kept an Holiday upon this occaſion; we may by the ſame reaſoning infer, they kept others for *Abraham*, for the man that had the palſy mention'd in *Matthew*, and for another mention'd in *John*. For concerning theſe alſo, he had Homilies.

The feaſt of the Reſurrection was plainly of Apoſtolical inſtitution. There were great diſputes between the eaſtern and weſtern Churches about the day whereon it ſhould be kept.

That it was very antient, I grant; but yet hardly believe it to have had ſuch an inſtitution. 'Tis not probable, the Apoſtles, who in delivering the Chriſtian religion to the

* *Vide p.* 301. *edit. Lat.* † Exercit. ii. *ſect.* 9. ‖ Iſid. Hiſp. De Off. Eccl. *lib.* i. *c.* 40.

world so perfectly agreed with one another, should in this particular so exceedingly differ. Further, that most antient, bitter, and idle contest between the eastern and western Churches, concerning the time of keeping this feast, shews that Apostolical tradition is not much to be regarded; since both sides pretended to have that for their warrant, tho' the Scripture said not a word about it. But since the Churchmen always keep this festival on a Lord's day, we will not quarrel about it, who think all such days are holy. We go on therefore to somewhat else.

The feast of the Ascension is not particularly mention'd in the oldest writers, being comprehended in the fifty days after Easter, *which were all Holidays.* One may well wonder, how the Churchmen in this matter imitate the antients. The latter kept Holiday for fifty days together; the former only observe three beside the Lord's days, namely the second, third, and fortieth. The latter had no particular regard to Ascension day; and, for ought appears, no more thought of the Ascension on that day, than on any of the rest; but the former celebrate one peculiar day, as a feast in memory of the Ascension. Every one must see how little agreement there is between these things. We agree with our Author, that it was observ'd in *Austin*'s time, that is, about the year 400.

Concerning *Pentecost*, or *Whitsunday*, we will not contend any more than about *Easter*; since that also, always falls on a Lord's day; and we grant a regard was paid to it ever since *Tertullian*'s time; so that it is needless to say any thing of our Author's testimonies.

*Because the Apostles were constant attendants on our Lord, and advanc'd by him to that high Order, every one of them hath his day assign'd him, to the end we may meditate on his holy example, and endeavour to follow the same steps of piety and virtue.**

Thus, for instance, the XXVIII of *October* is assign'd to the holy Apostles *Simon* and *Jude*. Now this is all that is done on that day more than any other. First the *Collect* is read: "O Almighty God, who hast built thy Church "upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus "Christ himself being the head corner stone, grant us to "be join'd together in unity of spirit, by their doctrine, that "we

* *Page* 311.

" we may be made an holy temple, acceptable unto thee, " through Jesus Christ our Lord. *Amen.*" Then are read the eight first Verses of the *Epistle* of *Jude*, and the eleven last Verses of the xv *chap.* of *John*. And so the example of *Simon* is propos'd to be meditated on by the people, when he is not so much as nam'd, or any thing said with a peculiar relation to him. But what is said on this festival may as well on any other. I could mention other things in these feasts as little to the purpose; but I had rather our Brethren abroad should learn them from the Liturgy it self. And in my mind it looks very childish, to pretend to propose severally the examples of those Apostles, concerning whom we know nothing at all in particular. But I proceed to our Author's Margin, where he treats further of this matter.

In the first times there were only festivals in honor of our Lord. Let our Adversaries then own, that we come nearest to the pattern of the first, that is the purest Church; since we have no other festivals but the Lord's days, which are in honor of him: nor let them go on to give us any disturbance, for our imitating the most antient and perfect Church, and rejecting the inventions of the latter and more corrupt times.

Afterwards the Martyrs were piously commemorated. Those pious men, who began this custom, did not apprehend what the consequence would be. Our Author places the beginning of it in the year 170, at the martrydom of *Polycarp*. Now this in 40 years after was degenerated into gross superstition, as appears by what I have before cited from *Tertullian: We make oblations for the dead, and for their martyrdom on a stated day yearly.* This superstition greatly increas'd in the following ages. And there is no reason, why we should judge those customs fit to be retain'd, which so soon became, if they were not in their very beginning, superstitious.

Our Author after tells us, this was done *for these reasons: That we might be incited to the imitation of their godly zeal, and constancy unto death, as* Basil *speaks*, Asc. *c.* 40. This I own was the true and only reason of their first institution. However I let the reader know, that *Basil* is not there speaking of the anniversary festivals of the Martyrs, but of their sepulchres, which us'd often to be visited by Christians. But our Author suggests another reason of these feasts: *And likewise, that people by such means*

might be brought off from the profane revels of the Heathen. If their firſt original be conſider'd, I dont think any manner of regard was had to this deſign. But when the *Roman* Emperors embrac'd Chriſtianity, and many of their ſubjects in all parts began to profeſs it, as a national religion, rather in complaiſance to them, than from a conviction of the truth of it, who yet were fond of, or at leaſt not ſufficiently averſe to their old ſuperſtition; then 'tis probable the eccleſiaſtical governors made uſe of this inſtitution to bring them off by little and little: which is confirm'd by the teſtimony of *Theodorit*, before mention'd. There might perhaps be yet another reaſon for this practice; namely, that in the third Century, they might think theſe oblations were profitable to the Martyrs, for whom they offer'd them. And why might they not think ſo of them, as they certainly did of all the reſt of the faithful who were departed? That this was *Tertullian*'s opinion is plain, not only by his words mention'd before, but by ſeveral other places.* In the next Century indeed they thought otherwiſe of the Martyrs, upon whom they beſtow'd many new honors, making them the guardians of places, as I ſhall ſhew afterwards. Hence *Auſtin* rejects praying for the Martyrs, as a great abſurdity. † This conjecture will be the more probable, if Mr. *Chillingworth*'s words are true: "I ſee plainly, and with my "own eyes, that there are Popes againſt Popes, Councils "againſt Councils, ſome Fathers againſt others, the ſame "Fathers againſt themſelves, the conſent of one age "againſt the conſent of another age, the Church of one "age againſt the Church of another age." ‖

John *the Baptiſt, and* Stephen, *have the ſame honor done them; one becauſe he was Chriſt's forerunner, and the other his firſt Martyr.* Concerning both he ſpeaks in the Margin. And of the feaſt of *John* the Baptiſt he ſays: That 'tis *very antient: for* Maximus Taurinenſis *has a Homily upon it, about* A. D. 400. Without doubt this is falſe printed, both in the *Latin* edition, and the Tranſlation; for in the foregoing Page the Doctor ſays he flouriſh'd in the year 450. And indeed he is reckon'd to have died in 455, or 456. Now I think it unreaſonable to call a thing very antient, becauſe

---

* *Vide* De Monog. c. 10. † De Verb. Apoſt. Serm. xvii. ‖ Relig. of Prot. a ſafe way. c. vi. *ſect.* 56.

becauſe mention'd by an author of his time. And by the ſame right may many of the Popiſh feſtivals be ſaid to be very antient. And truly I can't underſtand, how he can expect to defend his cauſe by theſe middle ages of the Church, in the things about which he owns they were often miſtaken.

But he goes on to *Stephen*, and ſays: *If his feſtival was not one of the firſt, there are Homilies upon him very antient. See* Chryſoſt. *and* Greg. Naz. *Du Pin* and Dr. *Cave* both ſay, 'tis doubtful, whether thoſe Homilies are *Chryſoſtom*'s. But if they were, what do they ſignify to our controverſy? He is often ſpoken of, and highly commended in ſermons both by us, and all thoſe Chriſtians every where, who keep no feſtival upon his account. *Maximus Taurinenſis* had another Homily upon him, which is alſo put, but more at large, among *Auſtin*'s works. But that our Author may ſee how little deference we pay to ſuch antiquity, I will tell him of *Gregory Nyſſenus*, who not only has a Homily upon him, but expreſly mentions his feſtival in it.

Our Author acknowledges: *The feaſts of the Converſion of* St. Paul, *of* St. Mark, *and* St. Luke, *were not kept before the* xii *or* xiii *Centuries:* which antiquity we deſpiſe. But *the feaſt of the Martyrdom of* St. Paul *he makes much antienter.* And that notwithſtanding their regard to antiquity, they never obſerve. I paſs over ſeveral things in the *Latin* edition, which the Tranſlator did not think worth inſerting; and ſo I ſhall the feaſt of the *Holy Innocents*, for which our Author has produc'd no teſtimony at all; and the feaſt of *All Saints*, which firſt ſprang from the ſuperſtition of the Heathens; and ſo I come to that of *St. Michael*.

And that the people may know what benefit Chriſtians receive by the miniſtry of Angels, the feaſt of St. Michael *and all Angels is ſolemnly obſerv'd in the Church.** Now in order hereto, is read on that day this Collect: "O everlaſting God, who haſt "ordain'd and conſtituted the ſervices of Angels and men "in a wonderful order; mercifully grant, that as thy "holy Angels alway do thee ſervice in heaven, ſo by thy "appointment they may ſuccor and defend us on earth, "thro' Jeſus Chriſt our Lord." And for the Epiſtle is read *Rev.* vii. from Verſe 7 to the 13: and for the Goſpel, are read the ten firſt Verſes of the xviii of *Matthew*. What par-

* *Page* 212.

ticular advantage there is in reading those places of Scripture on that day of the year, rather than any other, I can't imagine. Further, since many learned and pious men have thought *Michael* to be no other than Christ, *the Angel of the Covenant*; let our Adversaries consider with what prudence they join him with ordinary Angels, and so give him no more honor than they do them. Our Author does not trace the antiquity of this feast, but contents himself with rejecting the fabulous account the Papists give of the matter, which he makes our Reformers to have despis'd. The reason he alledges, why they, notwithstanding, retain'd it, is not rightly translated, but should be thus: *In reforming the Church they would not be too scrupulous, and therefore retain'd all those indifferent things, which might be any way useful.* Now this is very false. How many feasts of the Martyrs have they rejected, which are not less indifferent, than those retain'd? Anointing is reckon'd by Dr. *Hammond* indifferent. The vulgar use of the sign of the Cross must be reckon'd by our Adversaries of the same nature; or they do very ill to alledge *Tertullian*'s testimony, which speaks only of that use of it: The mixture of wine and water in the Lord's Supper, mention'd by *Justin Martyr*, is as much indifferent; and by *Cyprian* is pretended to be of singular use: and yet all these, and many more of the like nature, have they laid aside.

Thus far of the festivals of the Church. It remains that we now treat of her fasts. And here we are told: *The same mean is the rule of their fasts.* And what that *mean* is, the considerate reader will easily perceive from what has been said already.

Our vigils are only the eves of the feasts of the Apostles according to primitive discipline. This is not true: neither all the feasts of the Apostles, nor they only have *vigils* annex'd to them. For *St. Philip*, and *St. James*, tho' they have but one Holiday allow'd betwixt them, have no *vigil* to go before it. The Conversion of *St. Paul* is likewise without a *vigil*; and so he has less honor done him, according to our Author's notion of the matter, * than *John* the Baptist, whose feast is preceeded with a *vigil*; notwithstanding that our Saviour himself has assur'd us, that *the least in the kingdom of heaven is greater than he.* † The *primitive discipline* he

* *pag.* 305. *Lat. edit.* † Matth. xi. 11.

he here talks of, is not the discipline of the three first, but of some later ages of the Church; as he shews in the Margin. There he asserts the vigils of the primitive Christians were held in the nature of festivals, whereas the Church of *England's* are fasts: they held it unlawful to fast between *Easter* and *Whitsunday*; she appoints these vigils as fasts, the eves before *Ascension day*, and *Whitsunday*: they kept their *vigils* together in their Churches; she has no such nocturnal assemblies. If the first original of these *vigils* be inquir'd after, I am of our Author's mind, they are owing to the primitive persecutions. *Vigils*, says he, *were antiently assemblies of Christians by night, in times of persecution, when they durst not meet in the day time.* This is confirm'd by what *Pliny* and *Tertullian* say of those assemblies. Now if this was the first reason of them; I can't see why they should not have been laid aside, when the reason of them ceas'd. But our Author observes they practis'd otherwise: *And they were kept up, even in the peaceful times of the Church, on the eves of great festivals.* Our Author was mistaken in thinking these vigils were at first observ'd in a festival manner, whereas they were kept as fasts. And I wonder he should not have perceiv'd this, since it was most for his purpose. But he is not less out of the way, when he pretends they preceeded not only the *Easter* feast, but the great festivals in general. For I dont find that in the most antient times they religiously observ'd any vigils, but at *Easter*. And it appears from *Tertullian*, these were kept, not as feasts, but fasts.* The Christians of that time thought, they were bound by the command of Christ, *Matth.* ix. 15. to fast all the while, between the time of his Passion and his Resurrection. For they understood his words, as tho' he would have the time, wherein he was taken away from his Disciples by death, kept as an anniversary fast. And with I know not what vain superstition, they expected the return of the Bridegroom, upon the feast of the Resurrection. This fast therefore began on *Good friday*, the day of his Passion, when they *held a general religious fast*, as the same author testifies; which was not ended till *Easter day*.† The same thing further appears from *Epiphanius*, who opposes the vigils (which were become more numerous in his time) and the fasts, to the feasts; and gives the same rea-

* Lib. de Jejun. c. 1. † De Orat. in fin. p. 155.

ſon for this faſt, which he ſhews was ended at the Cock crowing on *Eaſter day*, when the people us'd alſo to be diſmiſs'd.* This is further confirm'd by a tradition, which antiently gain'd a great deal of credit; that the ſecond coming of our Saviour ſhould happen on this very night; for which reaſon they kept it with the greater ſolemnity. I will here alledge two notable teſtimonies, one of *Lactantius*, the other of *Jerom*, to ſhew they were of this opinion: "Then, *ſays Lactantius*, ſhall the heavens open, that the "light of the deſcending God may be ſeen like lightning "thro' the whole world. ---- This is the night which is "kept by us with watching, becauſe of the coming of our "King and God; for which there is a double reaſon, be-"cauſe then he receiv'd a new life after his Paſſion, and "becauſe then he is to receive the kingdom of the whole "world." † He deſcribes it indeed in a rhetorical manner, as tho' it had been kept as a feaſt; but that it was otherwiſe obſerv'd, at leaſt the former part of it, appears by what has been already cited from *Tertullian* and *Epiphanius*, and will yet further appear by this paſſage of *Jerom*: "Let me ſay ſomewhat, that may perhaps be profitable "to the reader. 'Tis a tradition of the *Jews*, that Chriſt "will come at midnight, in conformity to what was done "in *Egypt*, *viz.* when the paſſover is kept, and the de-"ſtroyer comes, and the Lord paſſes over our tabernacles, "and our foreheads, like their door poſts, are mark'd "with the blood of the Lamb. Hence, I ſuppoſe came "that Apoſtolical tradition, that on the *Eaſter vigils* 'tis "not lawful, before midnight, to diſmiſs the people, who "are expecting the coming of Chriſt; but after that time "is once paſt, we preſume he will not yet come, and ſo "all keep a feſtival." ‖ Now then, ſince neither perſecution, nor *Tertullian*'s interpretation of our Lord's words, *Matt.* ix. 15. nor this tradition, mention'd by *Lactantius* and *Jerom*, oblige us to keep theſe vigils; why ſhould we retain them? From what has been ſaid, the paſſage, refer'd to in *Euſebius*, may be eaſily underſtood; it refers to the *vigil* before *Eaſter*. I dont here regard the *pretended Ambroſe*, who is, in ſpite of the judgment of the learned Critics, trump'd upon us for the true. But let us hear the reſt of what he ſays on this Subject. *But*

* Expoſ. fid. Cathol. *ſect.* 22. † Inſtit. *lib.* vii. de vit. beat. *c.* 19.
‖ Comment. in Matt. xxv. 6.

But disorders growing in such assemblies, they were chang'd into fasts preparatory to such festivals; the old name of vigils *being still retain'd.** These disorders were not owing to the *vigils*, but to persons going to the tombs of the Martyrs to pray. This was done superstitiously, at any time, and gave an opportunity for wanton people to practise great wickedness; but there could be no danger of this from the *vigils*, which were kept in full assemblies in the Church. Our Author was here guilty of another grievous mistake, which the Translator gives me no occasion to take notice of. I therefore go on to the other fasts of the Church.

In conformity to which [primitive discipline] *we likewise keep* Lent, *and the four Ember weeks; that by the one we may be the better qualified to relish the joy of the resurrection; and may be dispos'd by the other to more importunate prayers for the grace of the Holy Spirit, upon all those who shall be admitted into sacred orders.* I shall consider these fasts distinctly. And as to *Lent*, we grant that in the second Century a fast used to go before *Easter*; but utterly deny it was a fast like that of our Churchmen, of forty days. The reason why we dont herein follow their example, is, because we either are utterly ignorant of the true motives, upon which they appointed such a fast; or those we are acquainted with, seem not to us sufficiently weighty. Nor dare we in the mean while offer to God any worship or service, for which we are not able to render a good reason. Our first Reformers judg'd fasting days were prescrib'd among us, not upon a religious account, but for the advantage of the civil state. They knew the people were commanded to eat fish on certain days, that so other meats might be spar'd, that fishing might be encourag'd, and the number of our mariners increas'd; and therefore they earnestly exhorted the people to obey these laws. Thus did *Latimer*, † *Hooper*, ‖ and the Homilies in Q. *Elizabeth*'s time; ‡ and the Lords of her Council declare the same thing. * If for such reasons alone we were required to forbear flesh, we should not contend: but when *Lent* is requir'd upon a religious account, 'tis quite another matter. Nor can our Adversaries agree about the reason of this fast; for some alledge the example of Christ, and fast forty days in a ludicrous sort of imitation

* *Pag.* 313. † Serm. iv. upon the Lord's prayer, *p.* 143. ‖ Serm. vii. upon Jonah. ‡ Homil. of fast. *part* ii. *p.* 89. * See Grindal's Life, *p.* 226, 227.

tion of him; but others give quite another reaſon for it. So our Author informs us: *Our learned Biſhop* Hooper *has made it probable, that our* Lent *is deriv'd from a like cuſtom of the* Jews, *who went thro' a ſolemn courſe of forty Days penance before their expiation.*

'Tis, I think, a demonſtration, this account of the learned Biſhop *Hooper* cannot be true. For if we ſhould ſuppoſe the *Jews* kept a forty days faſt before the day of expiation, yet the Lent faſt cannot be thought to be brought into uſe in imitation of them; becauſe then it ſhould have been a faſt of forty days from its firſt original; which it moſt certainly was not, nor for ſeveral Ages after it began to be kept. And if this were the firſt reaſon of appointing Lent, 'tis ſtrange no mention, no hint ſhould be given of it by any author, who liv'd near the time when it firſt began to be obſerv'd. But beſides, if the *Jews* kept ſuch a faſt; yet the primitive Chriſtians, who firſt ſet up this cuſtom, would have been ſo far from imitating them; that they would the rather, if we may believe *Tertullian*, have abſtain'd from ſuch a practice, becauſe they had us'd it. For thus he explains and carps at the opinion of the Catholics: "Truly they think thoſe days are in the Goſpel "appointed for faſting, in which the Bridegroom was taken "away, and that theſe are the only lawful Days for Chriſ- "tian faſts, the old cuſtoms under the Law and the Pro- "phets being aboliſh'd; for where they have a mind, "they underſtand what that means, *The Law and the Pro-* "*phets were till* John." * *Tertullian* ſpeaks of the faſt before *Eaſter*, which was then in uſe; but which was not a faſt of forty days continuance, as I will ſhew afterwards more fully. I only take notice, the Catholics were ſo far from an inclination to conform themſelves to the *Jewiſh* faſts, that they rather counted them old aboliſh'd cuſtoms of the Law.

I ſhall now proceed to conſider the teſtimonies our Author refers to; wherein I ſhall chuſe rather to follow the order wherein the Doctor himſelf ſet them down, than that of the Tranſlator.

The thing he aſſerts, and would prove, is: *That this Quadrageſimal* [that is forty days] *faſt has been obſerv'd ever ſince the Apoſtles times.* And for this, the firſt authority alledg'd

* De Jejun. *c.* 2.

ledg'd is *Euſebius*, *E. H. lib.* v. *c.* 23. Since the Tranſlator has not ſet down his words, I ſhall only give this brief account of them: *Euſebius*, who wrote in the former part of the fourth Century, there gives his own judgment, concerning the controverſy there had been between the eaſtern and weſtern Churches, about the time of keeping *Eaſter*, and ſo of putting an end to the faſt before it; and ſhews he thought the cuſtom of thoſe in the *weſt* was from Apoſtolical tradition. But 'tis certain, thoſe of the *eaſt* were not leſs confident, that Apoſtolical tradition was on their ſide. By which it appears, what a vain thing that is, which both parties equally pretended to, and by which they were not able to determine this trifling controverſy. Who that conſiders this, will ever much believe them, when they boaſt of Apoſtolical tradition; ſince they could not believe one another. Further what are theſe things to his purpoſe? they ſhew they had a faſt, but not that it was of forty days; for there is not a word of any ſuch thing in the place.

The next paſſage is the next *Chapter* in the ſame Author, and is taken out of a Fragment of a noble Letter of *Irenæus*. I ſhall tranſlate this teſtimony, becauſe 'tis full againſt the practice of the Church of *England*. Thus then the Fragment begins: "There is a controverſy not only περὶ τῆς ἡμέρας, "about the day, [Dr. *Nichols* thinks he means *Eaſter day*; Dr. *Grabe* ſays he intends *the time of the faſt*, and his following words carry it clearly for the latter] "but alſo the very manner of the faſt. For ſome think they ought to faſt one "day, ſome two, ſome more, ſome forty hours, night and "day, συμμετρεῖσι τὴν ἡμέραν αὐτῶν, *making the time of their "Faſt to anſwer in length.*" Dr. *N.* put a period after *forty*; and ſo would have made this a clear evidence of their practice. But he had no warrant for it, nor was the thing fair. Some bold Men have taken that liberty with *Irenæus*'s words; but *Valeſius* and Dr. *Grabe* give up that pretence. It muſt be own'd there is ſome difficulty in the laſt expreſſion. Whence *Valeſius* would have chang'd ἡμέραν into νηστείαν. But Dr. *Grabe* diſapproves his conjecture, and makes ἡμέρα in both places to ſignify *time* in general, whom I have therefore follow'd in tranſlating it. But I am apt to think, *Irenæus*, in the word συμμετρεῖσι, would hint to us the reaſon why they made their faſt juſt-forty hours long. *Tertullian* informs us, they kept that faſt, becauſe of the Bridegroom's being taken away. For the antient Chriſtians,

as

as I said, thought Christ commanded his Disciples to fast every year, during the time he was taken away from them, that is, all the while between the time of his Passion and Resurrection. Hence some, computing the time of his being taken away to be forty hours, made their fast just of the same length. If *Irenæus*'s Epistle were perfect, this conjecture might perhaps be confirm'd by it, as if in the former part of it, he had said any thing concerning the space of time, in which Christ remain'd under the Power of death; or had hinted the same reason, *Tertullian* does, for their keeping the fast; one or t'other of which it seems probable he had there taken notice of. But since the whole Epistle has not been preserv'd, we cannot be certain hereof. We leave therefore the conjecture to the judgment of the learned. However from *Tertullian*'s account we may perceive, what was the occasion of their different customs in observing this fast. For they who fasted one day, may be thought to understand Christ, as requiring them only in general to fast; they that would have it continu'd to forty hours, reckon'd the whole space of time between his death and resurrection for the absence of the Bridegroom; others judging the Bridegroom was taken away as soon as he was betray'd or condemn'd, made their fast still longer. And that there was a vast difference all along in the manner of observing this fast, may appear by what *Socrates* and *Sozomen* have related in their Histories. *But *that a Quadragesimal fast of forty days was observ'd*, as our Author asserts, *ever since the Apostles days*, is so far from being true, that there was no such thing for the first six hundred years. This is evident from the Testimony of Pope *Gregory*, who died, *A. D.* 604. In a Sermon of his, upon the first day of *Lent*, he thus discourses: "From this day to *Easter* is just six weeks, "which contain xlii days. Of these, when the six *Sun-*"*days* are subtracted, there remain no more than xxxvi as "days of abstinence. But as the year consists of 365 days, "and we afflict our selves for xxxvi days, we give as it "were the tithe of the year to God, *&c.*" † And I suppose the reader will easily think, that at *Rome* they were as forward in these improvements as any where else; and that

* *Lib.* v. *c.* 22. *Lib.* vii. *c.* 19. *vid. etiam* Epiph. exp. fidei. † Hom. 16 de div. Lect. Evangel. *p.* 42 *comp.* Isid. Hisp. de Off. Eccl. *lib.* I. *c.* 36.

that if they had got no further than xxxvi days there, in DC years, there had been no faſt of XL days obſerv'd in the Church in any more antient times.

And as there was ſo great a difference in their manner of obſerving this faſt antiently; ſo there were ſome who ſeem to have been of our mind alſo, who thought there was no neceſſity for any ſuch faſt; as *Dionyſius Alexandrinus* informs us: "For neither, *ſays he*, do all alike keep theſe "ſix days of the faſt; for ſome faſt all the ſix, ſome two, "ſome three, ſome four, and ſome none." * And I cannot but think, upon an attentive review of the latter part of the Fragment, which *Euſebius* has preſerv'd us of *Irenæus*'s Epiſtle, that this faſt had, when he wrote it, but very lately been brought into the *Roman* Church. Let me ſet down the place: "The Presbyters that govern'd your Church "before *Soter*, I mean, *Anicetus*, *Pius*, *Hyginus*, *Teleſphorus*, "and *Xyſtus*, neither themſelves obſerv'd this faſt, [Dr. *Grabe* here adds in his Tranſlation, *on the ſame day with the Aſiatic Biſhops*, for which we thank him; ſince it ſhews, he thought there was need of it for his hypotheſis, tho' *Irenæus* ſays no ſuch thing] "nor ſuffer'd thoſe who be-"long'd to them to obſerve it. Nevertheleſs, they who "did not obſerve it, were at peace with thoſe who came "to them from other Churches, which did obſerve it; al-"tho' the keeping of it was much more contrary [μᾶλλον "ἐναντίον] to thoſe who obſerv'd it not at all" [This is a clear evidence. They who go upon the other ſuppoſition can make no ſenſe of the μᾶλλον here, which is plain enough thus underſtood; and therefore Dr. *Grabe* here only turns it, *valde adverſa eſt*] "and yet never any "were rejected for this." All the reſt of the Fragment runs exactly in the ſame ſtile. So that we may from hence determine, when this faſt came firſt into uſe in the *Roman* Church, *viz.* in the Popedom of *Soter*, which began *A. D.* 173.

The *Apoſtolical Conſtitutions* are next refer'd to, *lib.* v. *c.* 13. But 'tis manifeſt, they ſpeak of a faſt only of five days, beginning on the *Monday*, and ending on the *Friday*, not in the Paſſion week, but that next before it. And the faſt of the Paſſion week was reckon'd a diſtinct thing from that of the *Quadrageſima*. And whereas the Church of *England*

* Epiſt. ad Baſilid. *in* Bever. Pand. *tom.* ii. *p.* 3.

England fasts every *Saturday* in *Lent*, this is contrary to the custom mention'd in the *Constitutions*, and in several of the primitive writers, who attest they us'd to fast but one *Saturday* in the whole year, namely, that of the Passion week.

Next comes *Tertullian*, who, as we are told, *De Jejunio*, c. 1. says: *Those days are by the Gospel set apart for fasting, wherein the Bridegroom was taken away.* Which our Author thus explains: *i. e. when Christ retir'd into the desart, and fasted.* There can be nothing more silly, than this interpretation of *Tertullian*'s mind. I dare be confident, if *Tertullian* has any sense of what is done here below, he would much rather wish to have all his writings burnt, than explain'd in a manner so foolish, and injurious to our Saviour. There is no place in the Gospel, which the Catholics could here have an eye to, beside that which I have had occasion to mention before: *But the days will come, when the Bridegroom shall be taken from them, and then shall they fast.* * The Disciples of *John* the Baptist had ask'd: Why Christ's Disciples did not fast, since they and the Pharisees us'd that practice? Our Author thought, our Saviour answer'd them to this purpose: My disciples dont indeed now fast, because I, the Bridegroom, am present with them; but shortly the days will come, when I shall be taken away into the wilderness, and then they shall fast. But how I beseech you, could Christ say, the days would come, which were already past? If it were true, that the Disciples of Christ fasted while he was in the desart, he would not have told the inquirers, that the days of their fasting were coming, but that they were past, and the question insinuated a false charge. But since no such thing appears by his answer, he meant without all doubt the days wherein he should ascend into heaven, and no more converse with them here on earth. The interpretation of the primitive Christians, tho' it was not exactly true, yet is much preferable to that of our Author. For what he mistakes to have belong'd to the time past, they justly refer'd to the time to come. Hence it came to pass, that they in their anniversary fast, a little before the time of his death, imagin'd the Bridegroom taken from them, and with an idle superstition (pardon the expression) expected him

* Matth. ix. 13. Mark ii. 20. Luke v. 35.

him to return to them again, at the feaſt of the Reſurrection. Nor do *Tertullian*'s words admit of any other ſenſe. Whence *Rigaltius*, who could not believe the Catholics would take ſuch a courſe, plainly charges him with miſrepreſenting them. " For who, *ſays he*, can be-
" lieve *Tertullian*, when he tells us, the days wherein the
" Bridegroom was taken away, namely, *Good friday*, and
" the *Saturday* following it, making but 48 hours, were
" their *Quadrageſima*? " * The Catholics therefore thought thoſe two days were by Chriſt himſelf appointed for an annual faſt. Whence 'tis evident, we cannot be bound to imitate them. They, upon very weak reaſons, and miſtaken explications of the Scriptures, brought in many things, which ſhould have been quite laid aſide, as ſoon as men came to a better underſtanding of thoſe ſacred writings. I aſk now, whether is our Saviour to be thought to have ſpoken of that fanciful abſence, which the antients apprehended; or of that real one, which I have mention'd? If he ſpake according to their notion, we ought to keep a faſt, as they did, not of XL, but only of two days: if his words are to be underſtood in our ſenſe, why ſhould we be bound to follow their example, ſince we own there was no ſtrength in their reaſons? And who in his wits, will not readily ſay, on the feaſt of the Reſurrection, that the Bridegroom is ſtill taken away? As the primitive Chriſtians thought, this faſt was to be obſerv'd in obedience to Chriſt's command; ſo they judg'd all other faſts, concerning which Chriſt had given no commandment, ſhould be left to the liberty of Chriſtians. But we cannot think we are more oblig'd to obſerve the faſt before *Eaſter*, than any other; ſince Chriſt has not, if his words are rightly underſtood, any more commanded it. Nor do we herein want the authority of the antients, whoſe opinion is related by *Tertullian*, and ſhall be now ſet down a little more at large, than 'twas when I had occaſion before to ſpeak of it. " Truly they [the Catholics] think, thoſe
" days are ſet apart in the Goſpel for faſting, in which
" the Bridegroom was taken away; and that thoſe only
" are the lawful Chriſtian faſts, the old cuſtoms of the
" Law and the Prophets being aboliſh'd. For when they
" have a mind, they can tell what that means, *The Law and*
" *the*

* In Loc.

" *the Prophets were until* John. As to the reſt they think we " muſt faſt in a different manner, *non ex imperio novae* " *diſciplinae*, *not by virtue of any command of our religion*, " but according to our own free choice, as every one ſees " cauſe from times and circumſtances. Which agrees " with the practice of the Apoſtles, who impos'd no other " yoke of any faſt to be obſerv'd generally by Chriſtians." *. We gladly embrace this opinion of the antient Catholics, that all faſts, which are not commanded by our holy religion, are free, and left to every ones pleaſure. And I would fain have our Churchmen produce that command of our religion, that obliges us to obſerve this faſt of *Lent*, or the *Ember weeks*. I am ſenſible there are ſome, who, by the *nova diſciplina*, mention'd by *Tertullian*, underſtand *the diſcipline of the Montaniſts*; and think he oppoſes this not to the old diſcipline of the *Jews*, but to that of our Saviour and his Apoſtles. But which ever ſenſe his words are taken in, my argument, with a little variation, will have the ſame force. From what has been ſaid, it may eaſily appear, not only that the faſt of the antients was of a different length from that of the Churchmen, but that it was kept upon quite another account. They kept it becauſe of the Bridegroom's being taken away; but the reaſon of the Church's keeping it, may be learnt from the Collect for the firſt *Sunday* in *Lent*: " O Lord, who for our ſakes " didſt faſt forty days and forty nights, give us grace to " uſe ſuch abſtinence, that our fleſh being ſubdu'd to " the Spirit, we may ever obey thy godly motions in " righteouſneſs and true holineſs, to thy honor and " glory, *&c.*

As for what our Author refers to in *Origen*, we can't tell whether it be *Origen*'s, or *Ruffinus*'s teſtimony; beſides that, it does not help us to determine, what ſort of a *Quadrageſima* it was.

I ſhall, with the Tranſlator, paſs over many other teſtimonies, which the reader may, if he pleaſe, find conſider'd in the *Latin* edition. I come therefore to the laſt he mentions; which is that of *Socrates*, who treats of this matter with great judgment; and ſhews that neither the feaſt of *Eaſter*, nor the faſt that preceeded it, was owing to Apoſtolical tradition; nor does he mention

* De Jejun *c.* 2.

mention a forty days fast. He shews on the contrary, that in different places they us'd very different customs; that at *Rome* they fasted three weeks before *Easter*, excepting only *Saturdays* and *Sundays*; that in *Illyricum*, *Achaia*, and *Alexandria*, they fasted six weeks before *Easter*; that in other places, they began their fast seven weeks before *Easter*, but fasted only three of them, and but five days in each; and that they all agreed in calling these their fasts *Quadragesima*. Now these customs did not more differ from one another, than they all manifestly do from that of the Church of *England*.

I have said enough, if not too much, of *Lent*: it remains now, that I consider the *Ember weeks*. These, he tells us, were appointed, that we *may be dispos'd by them to more importunate prayers, for the grace of the Holy Spirit upon all those who shall be admitted into sacred Orders*. These *Ember weeks* are the *Wednesday*, *Friday*, and *Saturday*, after the first *Sunday* in *Lent*, after the feast of *Pentecost*, after *September* 14, and after *December* 13. These things were not practis'd in the primitive Church. For the *Lent* fast in those antient times was much shorter; nor did it begin so long before *Easter*, as to be able to take in these fasts. Nor were any *Saturdays* in the whole year, one only excepted, then kept as fasts, as I have shewn already; altho' the Church of *Rome* had, indeed, a more peculiar fashion, in *Socrates*'s time; when they fasted all the *Saturdays* in the year, except those in *Lent*. Concerning the rise of these fasts, our Author says: *That these* Ember weeks, *or* Jejunia quatuor temporum, *were of antient observation, appears from* Leo the Great's *Sermons upon them, about the middle of the fifth Century*. Since there are no footsteps of these fasts in any antient author before *Leo*, I believe they were instituted a little before his time. *Leo* makes the fast of the tenth month to be instituted before his time. "Our holy "Fathers, *says he*, being divinely inspir'd, appointed the "fast of the tenth month, that when they made an "end of gathering in the fruits of the earth, a reasona-"ble abstinence might be set apart for God." * And he was much in the right, in thinking a fast ought to be observ'd, which was *appointed by Fathers divinely inspired*. But since those Fathers seem to us neither very antient, nor *di-*

* Serm. v. De Jejun. decimi mensis.

vinely inſpir'd, we dont much regard their authority. Nay we reject that antiquity, which cannot be commended, but to the great detriment of the Reformation. *Leo* is taken notice of by *Proteſtant* writers, as a great promoter, if not the firſt beginner, of the papal tyranny. And I would fain have our Adverſaries firſt defend themſelves againſt the Papiſts, who argue from his authority, before they attempt to run us down with it. Theſe words of his are indeed remarkable, and he has many the like in his Sermons on the faſt of the tenth month: "On *Saturday* we will keep "our *vigils* in the Church of the bleſſed Apoſtle *Peter*, "who will vouchſafe, by his interceſſion, to help our "prayers, faſts, and alms." * *The Ordinations of the Clergy* were perform'd in the antient Church at any time of the year, as there was occaſion. If *Gelaſius* order'd they ſhould ordain four times in a year, his order was new, and had not been known even to his predeceſſor, *Leo* the Great.

Our Author has omitted the three *Rogation days*, being the *Monday*, *Tueſday*, and *Wedneſday*, before *Holy Thurſday*. They were firſt appointed upon the account of continual earthquakes and tempeſts at *Vienna*, and the great Church taking fire in that city, which St. *Mamertus* put a ſtop to by his prayers. † Whereupon he eſtabliſh'd theſe days to thank God for his mercy, and to prevent the like calamities for the time to come. I dont ſee how other nations ſhould be oblig'd to obſerve them, eſpecially after ſo many ages. They are contrary to the practice of the primitive Church, which reckon'd all faſting between *Eaſter* and *Whitſuntide* ſinful.

But our Author, at length brings in ſome body thus objecting, againſt what he has hitherto ſaid in this Chapter concerning both their feaſts and faſts: *But God ſays*, Six days ſhalt thou labour: *Therefore the Lord's Day, which ſucceeded in the room of the Sabbath, is the only day to be kept holy; all the reſt are for our worldly affairs.* ‖ Now this ſeems to him ſuch an abſurdity (as he afterwards calls it) as is moſt eaſily confuted. He therefore anſwers: *What man in his wits ever took this clauſe for any thing but a permiſſion?* But he may take notice, there have been thoſe, who have underſtood thoſe words, as carrying in them not only a *permiſſion*,

* Serm. i. † *Vid.* Du Pin Nouv. Bibl. *tom.* v. *p.* 9. ‖ *pag.* 314.

ſion, but a *precept*, and yet have been thought to be *in their wits*. Nevertheleſs, that we may not ſeem ill-natur'd, let us ſuppoſe they are only expreſſive of a *permiſſion*. By what right then do our Adverſaries take away from us that liberty, which God himſelf has granted us? God ſays: *Six days ſhalt thou labour*. The Churchmen ſay on the contrary: *Six days thou ſhalt not labour*. Strange boldneſs! By their own inſtitutions they would deprive all men of that very liberty, which they allow God has by expreſs command univerſally granted.

CHAP. XII.

Of Bowing at the Name of Jeſus.

OUR Author treats of two things in this Chapter: Firſt, What the Title expreſſes: Secondly, Bowing towards the Altar.

Concerning the former our opinion is. That all the worſhip we offer to God ought to be rational. But we can ſee no reaſon, why we ſhould rather bow at the name of *Jeſus*, than at the name *God*, *Jehovah*, *Chriſt*, or *Saviour*, which is the ſame with *Jeſus*. But our Adverſaries have not, as yet, gratify'd our moſt juſt requeſt: That they would either from the Holy Scriptures, or the nature of the thing, give us a reaſon for this worſhip. And therefore it cannot ſeem ſtrange, we do not obey their commands.

But let us hear our Author: *The repreſentation which theſe men make of our extravagant behaviour in this particular, as tho' we were frantic and turbulent in this geſture, is a ſtrain of rude rhetoric, very familiar to them on ſuch occaſions. We do reverence to our Lord, at the mentioning of his name, by a very ſedate inclination of the body, not making the leaſt noiſe, or giving the leaſt diſturbance to any one.* * But who knows not, that the cuſtoms of thoſe times, wherein this objection was made, are not to be learnt from the preſent practice? Our Adverſaries have had the advantage to learn by our admonitions, to ſhew their reverence in this reſpect more decently, than in former times. Hence all the late

* *pag.* 316.

writers on our ſide, never mention any thing of the ſcraping of the feet, which is, what the Doctor here particularly refers to. But 'tis plain from Archbiſhop *Whitgift*, that there was ſufficient ground for this objection in former times. For when he is anſwering that paſſage of the *Admonition*, which our Author ſets down in his Margin, he is ſo far from denying the truth of the objection, that he defends the cuſtom. He ſays: "*Kneeling* at the name of "Jeſus is indifferent." * And certainly a whole aſſembly can't kneel down in the middle of the ſervice without ſome conſiderable noiſe. He ſays likewiſe: "This hinder- "eth no more the word being read, then hawking and "ſpitting hindereth the ſame being preach'd." † By which he in effect owns ſome noiſe was made. And truly if every perſon made as much noiſe in his bowing, as a perſon does with hawking and ſpitting, the diſturbance muſt have been conſiderable. I dare ſay, any one would think ſo, if he were to ſee a whole congregation hawk and ſpit together by conſent. ‖

Our revilers think themſelves deficient in good breeding, if they do not make bows to one another in their Meeting-houſes, upon ſneezing. ‡ Juſt thus the Papiſts argue from the reſpect ſhewn to the King's picture, that honor is to be paid to the image of Chriſt. But Biſhop *Stillingfleet* anſwers, that the diſpute is about a religious, and not a civil reſpect. * We might here uſe the ſame anſwer, if his aſſertion were true. But 'tis indeed falſe. And tho', I thank God, I have been brought up among the Diſſenters from my infancy, yet never before did I hear this aſſerted to be their cuſtom in their aſſemblies. Hence our Brethren may judge, what credit this Author deſerves, when he talks of our prayers, *p.* 259. ſince he is ſo egregiouſly miſtaken in a thing that is certain. For 'tis well known, that ſome of our writers have condemn'd this practice, even out of worſhip, as fooliſh, ſuperſtitious, and heatheniſh. Nay, the *Weſtminſter Aſſembly* have declar'd againſt all ſuch kind of ſalutations, as our Author charges us with, in the time of religious worſhip; nor have we yet departed from their judgment.

If Chriſt is to be worſhip'd in our public prayers, why not at the mention of his name, whereby, as by a common token, the whole

---

* Def. of the Anſw. *p.* 741. † *p.* 742. ‖ *Comp. the* 52. Injunct. of Q. Elizab. *A.* 1559. ‡ *p.* 317. * Idolatry of the Church of *Rome*, *p.* 21.

whole congregation may be at once alarm'd, and excited to offer up their united devotions to God their Saviour ? Our Author does not here reflect so much upon us, as upon his own party. For the same reason holds, concerning the other names of our Saviour and of God. Nay the name *Jesus*, whenever 'tis pronounc'd, ought to stir them up to pay the same reverence; whereas they only bow their heads (as he presently tells us) when they recite his name in the Creed. For thus he goes on: *But 'tis against all reason that we are charg'd in being over officious and troublesom in this way of honoring our Lord. For when the name of* Jesus *occurs, either in reading Holy Scripture, or in the prayers of the Liturgy, we seldom take that express and solemn notice of it, as we do, when we pronounce the Articles of our faith in the Creed.* Who does not see, how disagreeable this is to the argument he just before alledges ? Yet, I believe what he says is true, concerning most places. For tho' this custom is more frequently us'd in Cathedral Churches; yet in parish Churches, 'tis, tho' contrary to the command of the Convocation, almost laid aside, except only in saying the Creed. And our Author's excuse seems not, to me, very civil to the Synod, which has otherwise determin'd; as will appear by their own words: "And likewise when in time of divine service the Lord Jesus shall be mention'd, due and "lowly reverence shall be done by all persons present, as "it hath been accustom'd." *

But our Adversaries would perhaps be less free with their tongues, if they well consider'd, that together with us, they involve almost all Protestants in the same crime of idolatry. †

But who of us ever charg'd them with idolatry upon this account ? Let the reader look back upon the passages which in his Margin he has transcrib'd from the writers of our side. There is not the least mention of the idolatry of this rite. Bowing, indeed, to the Altar is charg'd therewith; but that is a very different case, as we shall see presently. In the mean while let us go on with our Author:

For all who receive the Augustan *confession, and many other Churches in* Germany, *do agree with us to make a low reverence at the naming of* Jesus. ‖ I am wholly ignorant what those

* Can. xviii. † *pag.* 318. ‖ *pag.* 319.

other Churches of Germany ſhould be. But as to the *Lutherans*, I think thoſe words of Mr. *John Brentius*, a *Lutheran* Divine, deſerve to be taken notice of: "When "*Paul* ſays: *In the name of* Jeſus *every knee ſhall bow*, &c. "'tis not to be underſtood, as tho' men ought always to "bow their bodily knees, when ever his name is mention'd. "This is a childiſh ceremony, and to be us'd ſometimes "for the ſake of children." *

Nay the more modeſt Calviniſts, *tho' they dont approve this ceremony, by their own practice, yet are far from condemning others who uſe it.* And to this purpoſe *Pareus* is cited in the Margin. But who can help wondering that *Pareus*, ſo often condemn'd by the Churchmen, and whoſe Works were publicly burnt by a decree of the Univerſity of *Oxford*, ſhould now be reckon'd among the *more modeſt of the* Calviniſts? But thus uncertain and inconſtant men uſe to be, when they weigh things in a falſe balance, and judge of other mens manners, according as they ſeem to agree or diſagree with their own methods.

I am very well pleas'd, the Doctor acknowledges, the Apoſtle's words, *Phil.* ii. 10. which occaſion'd this cuſtom, dont at all relate to it. For if it be owing to mens miſtaking that place, ſince the miſtake is now diſcover'd, I can't think why we ſhould not lay it aſide. But our Author is deceiv'd, when he ſays preſently: *But neither we, nor they* [the Foreign Divines] *are ſo dull as to think, that theſe words can be rigorouſly apply'd to this purpoſe.* † For Dr. *Hammond* ſeems to follow *Grotius*, and not to diſlike that interpretation. Thus Mr. *John Browning*, a man of conſiderable learning and reputation, contends we muſt keep cloſe to the letter of this text. ‖ Nor does Dr. *Heylyn* otherwiſe explain it, alledging *Ambroſe*, and others of the antient Fathers, as maintainers of that interpretation. ‡ Biſhop *Montagu*'s words alſo, concerning this place, ought not to be paſs'd by: "The Church commends this place "to the people, underſtood in no other than a literal "ſenſe. So that as often as that moſt glorious "name, and eſpecially in a holy place, and in divine "ſervice, is pronounc'd by the reader, and heard by the "people, they preſently, in token of humility, ſubjection, "and

* *Cited by Mr.* Hickman Apol. *p.* 103. † *Vid.* Synopſ. Crit. in loc. ‖ Six Serm. concern. the Prayers and Faſts of the Church. *p.* 21. ‡ Cypr. Angl. *p.* 29.

" and obedience, bow their bodies to an adoring poſture, " and bend their knees, and own him as their Lord. " Which antient cuſtom the Church of *England* alſo uſes " in her ſeveral pariſhes, and carefully defends it by an " eccleſiaſtical law, the Sectaries in the mean while ſhew- " ing their teeth and ſpeaking againſt it." * To theſe I may add Mr. *John Swan*, who aſſerts that the Apoſtle in that place injoins this ceremony, and endeavours to anſwer our Author's reaſon for the contrary: " For, *ſays he*, " why may not the Apoſtle as well ſpeak here, after the " manner of men, and aſcribe knees to Angels, as he does, " elſewhere, tongues? †

We are now come to the other controverſy of this Chapter: *Of worſhiping towards the Altar.* ‖ And here the Doctor obſerves, *That no rule of* their *Church injoins* it. So far then I think ſhe is to be commended: for I would not have the leaſt ſhew of idolatry among Proteſtants. And truly if it were injoin'd, I ſhould think it a ſufficient reaſon to forſake the Churchmen, tho' there were no other. But if this be not (as it really is not) injoin'd by any rule of the Church; how can *Laud*, the famous Archbiſhop, and (as ſome reckon) Martyr of the Church, be vindicated from the charge of affecting a tyrannical power; ſince he not only commanded the ceremony, but ſeverely puniſh'd thoſe who refus'd to uſe it? But we may ſee there are Churchmen, who are ready to follow his example. For what elſe can be the meaning of theſe words of our Author?

But what if authority had commanded people to obſerve it? What mighty offence had been in all this? 'Tis no more than a rule to them, that at their coming into the Houſe of God, they ſhall ſhew ſome bodily reverence, in regard of the ſanctity of the place, and this towards the Altar; *that is looking ſtraight forward (for in moſt places where this ceremony is us'd, the doors are weſtward, and bring men in with their faces to the eaſt, that is, toward the Altar.) But becauſe the Church hath not directed them to turn to the right hand, or to the left, or quite backwards, with worſe manners ſtill; therefore they muſt needs be thought to worſhip tables and carpets, and to commit groſſer idolatry than the very Papiſts.* But how ſhall we be certain of this pretended *ſanctity* of their temples? We know of no inherent holineſs

* Orig. Eccl. *part* i. *p.* 123. † Profanomaſt. Matt. *p.* 49, 0 ‖ *pag.* 320.

in wood and ſtones; nor do we apprehend that one place is more holy than another, under the New Teſtament. Our Adverſaries would have every one, when he goes into a Church, tho' there be no body in it, ſhew reverence, becauſe of the ſanctity of the place; which ſavours of ſuperſtition, to ſay no worſe. Beſides, if men only bow right forwards as they enter the Church, what need is there of theſe words, *towards the Altar*? Nay, when they happen to enter the Church, not having their faces towards the Altar, why do they then turn their backs to the aſſembly, that ſo they may bow towards the Altar? I ſhould think there is a greater holineſs in the Church of God, that is, his people, than in their Altars. And yet I have ſeveral times ſeen this, however *unmannerly*, practis'd among them. Beſides, if our Author had no deſign of impoſing upon his reader, why did he not tell us for what reaſon, not only they who enter the Church, but they alſo, who come to, or go from the Altar, make their bows. And why may not theſe excuſes, he makes for his party, as well defend the antient Idolaters? Why might not the *Iſraelites* in like manner have pleaded, they did not worſhip the Golden Calf, or thoſe at *Dan* and *Bethel*, but only God towards them? And that the reaſon why they bow'd towards them, was only becauſe that coming towards them, *they neither turned to the right hand, nor to the left, or quite backwards, with worſe manners ſtill, but bow'd their bodies ſtraight forward*? There are two ſorts of idolatry, as we learn from the Scripture: one, which is forbidden in the firſt Commandment, when a falſe God (as *Baal*) is worſhip'd; the other, when the true God is worſhip'd, but the worſhip is directed towards any thing, (as the Golden Calf) that neither has any holineſs in itſelf, nor is any ſymbol or token of the divine preſence. And this we find is forbidden in the ſecond Commandment. How therefore our Adverſaries will be able to clear themſelves from all blame in this matter, 'tis their buſineſs to conſider. I ſhall conclude this Chapter with the words of the excellent Archbiſhop *Uſher*: "Altho' the groſs idolatry of Popery be taken "away from amongſt us, yet the corruption cleaveth ſtill "to the hearts of many; as may be ſeen in them that make "courteſy to the Chancel, where the high Altar ſtood. *

CHAP.

* Body of Divinity, *p.* 232.

CHAP. XIII.

Of reading Apocryphal Books in the Church.

THere is a hot diſpute between the Papiſts and Proteſtants, about the Canon of the Scripture. The Papiſts have for ſeveral ages commended to the people the Apocryphal Books, as tho' they were of equal authority with thoſe of the Old and New Teſtament; whereas the Proteſtants with one conſent agree, they are not to be reckon'd Canonical, and have every where, except in *England* and *Ireland*, laid aſide the public reading them in the Church. The queſtion is, whether this is not prudently done by our Brethren abroad, and whether the public reading theſe books, is without any danger preſcrib'd here among us? Few of the common people ever look into the Articles of the Church of *England*, to learn what her doctrine is; but what they know of it, is from daily uſe and cuſtom. So that when the *Apocrypha* is read at certain times, inſtead of the Holy Scriptures, and the Book of Common Prayer, which is in every ones hands, after ſetting down the order how the Pſalter is appointed to be read, preſcribes the courſe of both the Canonical and Apocryphal Leſſons, under this one general title: *The order how the reſt of the Holy Scripture is appointed to be read:* they give a handle to the crafty Papiſt of impoſing upon the ignorant ſort; nay, and the churchmen themſelves ſomtimes lead them into a great miſtake.

But our Author tells us: *The Church expreſly affirms, that the Canonical Books are the only rule of faith.** And for this he appeals to her VI Article. Now it muſt be own'd that Article is very expreſs in the matter. But the Church is hardly conſiſtent herein with her ſelf; for in her Homilies ſhe ſeems to ſpeak very differently of the *Apocrypha*. I might mention the frequent quoting the Book of *Wiſdom*, juſt as they wou'd do the Book of *Proverbs*, as tho' it were written indeed by the Wiſeman, that is, *Solomon*. This is done nine or ten times in the three parts of the Homily for *Rogation week*. Thus *Baruch* is cited as the *Prophet Baruch*;

* *pag.* 322.

ruch; and his writing is call'd, *The word of the Lord to the Jews.** And the book of *Tobit* is attributed to the Holy Ghoſt in theſe expreſs words: "The ſame leſſon doth the "Holy Ghoſt alſo teach in ſundry places of the Scripture, "ſaying: *Mercifulneſs and alms giving purgeth from all ſins, and* "*delivereth from death, and ſuffereth not the ſoul to come into* "*darkneſs*, &c."† Now if the *Apocrypha* is the word of God, and dictated by the Holy Ghoſt, I muſt confeſs I can't imagine why it ſhould not be counted Canonical Scripture, and as much a rule of faith as any part of the Sacred Book. This is doctrine, which I am not Latitudinarian enough to ſubſcribe, as *godly and wholeſom, and neceſſary for theſe times*; and which I ſhould never care to read in the Church. And I cannot here upon this occaſion but take notice, how very tender the Biſhops were in the *Hampton Court Conference* of the honor of thoſe Books; which ſhews they had themſelves got no good by the Church's order for the public reading them. For when Dr. *Rainolds* objected againſt them, Biſhop *Barlow* tells us: "The Bi- "ſhop of *London* ſhew'd: Firſt, for the antiquity of them, "that moſt of the objections made againſt thoſe Books, "were the *old cavils* of the *Jews*, renew'd by St. *Jerom*, in "his time, who was the firſt that gave them the name "of *Apocrypha*; which opinion, upon *Ruffinus*'s challenge, he "after a ſort diſclaim'd, the rather, becauſe a general "offence was taken at his ſpeeches in that kind." Firſt, [rather *Secondly*] "for the continuance of them in the "Church, out of *Kimedoncius* and *Chemnitius* two modern "Divines. The Biſhop of *Winton* remember'd the diſtinc- "tion of St. *Jerom*, that theſe Books are *Canonical*, for in- "formation of manners, but not for confirming any matter "of faith; which diſtinction, he ſaid, muſt be held for "the juſtifying ſundry Councils."‖ So that the Biſhop of *London* knew of no objections againſt them, but ſome *old Jewiſh cavils*; and the Biſhop of *Winton* allow'd them to be half Canonical. But how they could be canonical for manners, and not for faith, is too myſterious for my underſtanding. I ſhould be glad to know, whether the Angel's teaching young *Tobias* how he might funk away the Devil *Aſmodeus*, relates not rather to manners than to faith;

---

* *Part.* i *of the* Hom. againſt wilful Rebel. *p.* 281. † *Part* ii. *of* Hom. of Alms Deeds. ‖ *p.* 61.

faith; and whether the Book of *Tobit* be Canonical to direct our manners in such things?

Our Author likewise adds, from the Article: *The Apocryphal* [Books] *are read for example of life, and instruction of manners; but not to establish any doctrine.* We grant many excellent things are contain'd in those Books; but there are several wretched lies told in them too; which many think are more likely to make people laugh, and to corrupt mens manners, when they are read to them, than to promote piety; altho' the Church affirms: "Nothing is "ordain'd to be read, but the pure word of God, the "Holy Scriptures, or that which is agreeable to the "same."*

Tho' she esteems the word of God the best means, whereby to instil piety and virtue into mens hearts; yet she can never be perswaded that 'tis a sin to read other sort of writings, compos'd by the best of men, and well suited to the edification of the hearers. For if so, then to what purpose should there be any preaching of sermons? How would the people neglect the best performances of this kind, if they were once perswaded, that it was unlawful for them to hear any thing, but pure, literal Scripture? Sermons serve to explain the Holy Scriptures, and to inculcate the prescrib'd duties of religion; and therefore Ministers are bound to preach them, altho' no one takes them to be inspir'd. But 'tis quite another thing, when foolish, absurd, false and wicked things are read instead of the Holy Scripture.

The sense of the antient Church was the same in this, with that of ours at this day.† Dionysius *of* Corinth, *who liv'd in the second Century, acquaints us, that* Clement's *Epistle was read, according to antient custom, in the Church of* Corinth:‖ *and* Eusebius *says it was read in his time, in many Churches.*‡ But *Justin* gives a very different account of the custom of his time: That the writings of the Apostles or Prophets were read, as the time would allow.* But what a weak way of reasoning is this? The antients read an excellent and pious Epistle of *Clement* to the people: therefore the conjurations of *Tobit*, and the forg'd lies of *Judith*, *Susannah*, *Bell and the Dragon*, are to be read to the people instead of Holy Scripture. But take the reason of this from

---

* *Preface to the* Comm. Prayer, *conc. the Serv. of the Church.* † *Page* 323.
‖ Eusеb. *lib.* iv. ‡ *Id. lib.* iii. * Apol. ii.

from the learned Biſhop *Beveridge*: " Both theſe Epiſ-
" tles, *ſays he*, of *Clement*, are written at the end of that
" moſt antient Copy of the Old and new Teſtament,
" kept in the King's Library (from whence alſo, they were
" firſt publiſh'd) in the ſame hand, and with the ſame
" great letters. So that we may probably conjecture theſe
" Epiſtles, at the time and place of writing the ſaid copy,
" were reckon'd among the Canonical Books, according to
" the order of this Canon; otherwiſe, 'tis hard to give an
" account, why they ſhould be thus bound up together."*
Now if this conjecture be true, what wonder was it, an Epiſtle, which they judg'd to be Canonical, ſhould be read in the Church? But what we blame the Churchmen for, is very different. For thoſe Books which they acknowledge themſelves to be Apocryphal, they not only bind up with the Bible, but read them inſtead thereof.

St. Auſtin *relates how the hiſtories of the Martyrs were read in the* African *Church, with certain narratives of miracles obtain'd by the Chriſtians Prayers.*† *Auſtin* in that Chapter ſpeaks not a word of the reading the hiſtories of the Martyrs, altho' the thing is certain enough from other teſtimonies. The *narratives of miracles* were indeed read to the people. But the cuſtom began in *Auſtin*'s time, who firſt introduc'd it. But theſe things ſignify little in our caſe. For they read them not inſtead of Canonical Scripture, nor did they read any thing but what they believ'd to be certainly true; whereas our Adverſaries read that to the people, which they know is certainly falſe.

The Books of Wiſdom, Eccleſiaſticus, Tobit, Judith, *and the* Maccabees, *are recommended by the Council of* Carthage, *to be publicly read in the Church.*‖ To the Council of *Carthage*, I oppoſe the more ancient Council of *Laodicea*, which forbids the reading any Books in the Church, which are not Canonical;‡ and reckons up the Canonical Books exactly as we do, ſaving that it leaves out the *Revelation*.* And when the Council of *Carthage* recommends thoſe Books of *Wiſdom*, &c. to be read, under what notion does it recommend them, as *Canonical* or *Apocryphal*? Truly as Canonical. Hear the words of the Canon: " It ſeems
" good to us that nothing be read in the Church under
" the

* *In* App. Can. lxxxv. *Vid.* Cod. Can. Eccl. Primit. Vindic. *lib.* ii. *c.* 9. *ſect.* 12.
† De Civit. Dei. *lib.* xxii. *c.* 8. ‖ Conc. Carthag. Can. xlvii. ‡ Can. lix.
* Can. lx.

" the name of Holy Scripture, besides the Canonical " Writings. Now the Canonical Writings are, *&c.*" and among them those Books are mention'd. Nay, even the Council of *Nice* reckon'd *Judith* Canonical, as *Jerom* testifies. * *Cyprian* took the *Maccabees* for such. † The Books of *Wisdom*, *Ecclesiasticus*, and *Maccabees*, contain abundance of profitable things; and *Tobit* has some that are not contemptible; but in each of these there are some mistakes. And unless our Adversaries design to teach people magic, they would act more prudently, if they omitted the VI chapter of *Tobit*. But as to the ill contriv'd Fables of *Judith*, *Susannah*, *Bell* and the *Dragon*, they dont deserve to be read in private.

And Ruffinus *tells us they were also read in his time, tho' never made of equal authority with Canonical Scripture.* ‖ I own, *Ruffinus* says so, and seems to have been of that opinion; but I much doubt whether this were the common sentiment of that Age. *Jerom*, as I observ'd, makes the *Nicene* Fathers to have had a different notion of *Judith*. Nor could *Jerom* and *Ruffinus* agree about the Canon of the Scriptures. For *Jerom* rejects the stories of *Susannah*, *Bell* and the *Dragon*, which he several times calls Fables. ‡ But *Ruffinus* reckon'd these, or at least *Susannah*, and the *Hymn* of the *Three Children* Canonical. And yet when *Ruffinus* objected against *Jerom*, that he rejected those additions to the Prophecy of *Daniel*; * he was afraid to defend his opinion, tho' he had plainly enough profess'd it before, and therefore most craftily evades what his adversary had urg'd against him: † whence one may well guess, he departed from the receiv'd opinion of his own time. And *Cyril* of *Jerusalem* says, no *Apocryphal* Books were read in the Church, and forbids the private reading of them. I regard the authority of later writers as little in this controversy, as in many others. And therefore I pass by what he says of *Isidorus*, and *Rabanus Maurus*, altho' he is grossly mistaken in the opinion of the former, as will presently appear to any one who looks into his writings. ‖

From what has been said, I suppose, 'tis sufficiently evident the Doctor has in vain attempted to defend his cause from the practice of the antient Church. But since the opinions

---

* *Præf. in* Judith. † Epist ad Cornel. ‖ Ruff. in Symbol. ‡ *Præf. in* Dan. *& in c.* xiii. *in initio.* * Invect. ii. *in* Hieron. † *Vid.* Hier. Apol. ii. ‖ *Vide* Orig. *lib.* vi. *c.* 1. *Item* Lib. Proœmior.

opinions of the ancient writers differ so much about the Canon of the Scripture, I will dispatch this matter in a few words. Either therefore these Books, which are call'd *Apocryphal*, were at first reckon'd Canonical, and therefore publicly read in the Church; or else while they were read, tho' not reckon'd at first Canonical, their authority by degrees and insensibly increas'd, till at last they came to be esteem'd as a part of the Canon of Scripture. Our Author may chuse which he pleases. If the former; the antients are to be commended, who injoin'd the reading all those books which they counted Canonical; but our Adversaries are to be blam'd, who will not suffer *Solomon's Song*, and other parts of the Holy Scripture, which they own to be Canonical, to be read to the congregation. But what can it signify to us, who unanimously declare those Books are not Canonical? If on the other hand he chuses the latter; we hence see those books cannot without great danger be long read in the Church: and the Council of *Carthage*, which the Doctor appeals to, gives this reason for their account of the Canon of the Scripture: That they had receiv'd it from the Fathers, that those books ought to be read in the Church: and therefore being warn'd by their example, we should take great care not to fall into the same evil with them. * For what has been formerly the effect of any course, may be so again. But let us return to the Doctor.

But there is not one Sunday *in all the year, on which any of our Lessons are taken out of an Apocryphal Book. That distinguishing honor is paid to the Sacred Scripture alone, to be read on these solemn occasions. And because then are the greatest assemblies of Christians, both of learned and unlearned, 'tis wisely order'd, that they should be all instructed out of the genuine word of God, and that ignorant people should have nothing to take offence at.* † I can't see how this will consist with what he says himself. For if the Apocryphal Books are therefore read, as he tells us himself in his *Latin* edition, that *people may, by the excellent examples, and useful counsels of pious men, which are contain'd therein, be the more earnestly excited to lead a good life*; ‖ why should not lessons taken out of them be useful on *Sundays*, when they ought to be as earnestly excited to this, as at any time whatever? And what *offence*, I pray, can be taken

* Can. 47. † *page* 324. ‖ *page* 320.

taken at the *excellent examples and useful counsels of pious men*? But see now how little countenance they have herein from the primitive Christians. They us'd to read such kind of writings, as particularly *Clement*'s Epistle, on the Lord's Day, not suspecting any danger therein :* our Adversaries, on the contrary, think they sufficiently guard against what they acknowledge to be a real danger, by reading these books at a time when ignorant people cannot be present. And thus at length we have got their confession, who formerly maintain'd, there was no danger at all in these Apocryphal lessons. Seeing therefore the congregations of our adversaries are never made up entirely of learned men, but ignorant people are always more or less mix'd with them, those lessons cannot be prudently injoin'd. But let us hear the rest: *The Apocryphal Books are assign'd either to the festivals of Saints, or the common week days, and to the autumn quarter, when harvest work makes country congregations thin. And even the second lesson is always Canonical Scripture. Which one would think should silence the calumniating tongues of our Adversaries on this head.* Our Author was greatly deceiv'd in thinking this a satisfactory answer. For beside what is already said, there is no necessity for these lessons. Why then should they give men any occasion to *take offence*? Further, this defence is weak. For in villages where men live, who employ themselves in harvest work, there are very seldom any assemblies on week days, but this is more usual in cities and market towns; altho' in them also there are many ignorant people. Nay, in many such places men have in autumn little to do. And if our Author has assign'd the true reason of their practice, why is an apocryphal lesson appointed for *Innocents day*, *December* 28; a time when men have more leisure than all the year beside?

But the Doctor goes on, and starts an objection, which he saw we might easily make: *But these stories exclude a great part of the Canonical Scripture out of the Church.* But being convinc'd of this truth, and wanting a reason whereby to defend their practice, he has recourse to the sly arts of Rhetoricians. First therefore he says: *I wonder with what face the objectors can say this?* With a very modest one sure, as we shall see presently. Next he endeavours to elude

* Euseb. E. H. *lib.* iv. *c.* 23.

elude the force of the objection, by making a comparison between their custom and ours. *I would undertake, at the hazard of my life, to make it as clear as the sun, that there is more Canonical Scripture read in our Churches (even tho' we should except the Psalms, Epistles and Gospels) in two months, than there is in a whole year in the largest Meetings of our Adversaries.* But even thus he does not untie, but cut the knot. For if these Apocryphal lessons come in the room of the Sacred Scriptures, our argument remains good. How much of the Scripture shall be read at a time in the assembly, is no where appointed in the word of God, but is wholly left to the prudence of every Church. Nor have we ever complain'd that the Church's appointed lessons were too short. But we blame our Adversaries for spending frequently that time in these Apocryphal lessons, which might better be employ'd in reading Canonical Scripture. Besides, the comparison is not fairly put: for their morning and evening prayers are instead of family prayer; and therefore, our Adversaries think persons need not use family prayer, when they can attend those in public. The comparison therefore should have been made between what they read in the Church on the one side, and what we read both in the Church and in our families on the other. And when 'tis so put, our Author's assertion will be found to be false. But now if any are not satisfy'd with this answer, our Author has another ready for them, which, as the fullest of all, he has reserv'd for the last. *But to rid our hands of this calumny, that we exclude the Scriptures, let it be remember'd, that almost the whole Bible is read over in our Church once a year,* [*viz.* in those places where there are prayers morning and evening all the year round, which are comparatively very few] *a few genealogical or obscurely prophetical Chapters being omitted.* * The Translator should have added: *Or some others which speak too broadly (according to the custom of those in* Asia) *of obscene matters, and might cause disorderly motions in unsettled minds.* And here our Adversaries imitate the antients likewise; those I mean, who *strain'd at a gnat, and swallow'd a camel.* † For, according to the judgment of these men, the Word of God must not be read in a Christian congregation, while the notorious and magical lies of the *Apocrypha* are without

* *Pag.* 325. † Matth. xxiii. 24.

without any danger put in the room of it. I suppose *Solomon's Song* is here particularly intended by our Author. This Book, which is so often cited by the Fathers, and upon which they have written commentaries, is never read in the Church of *England*'s assemblies, lest the too *broad speeches* in it *should cause disorderly motions in unsettled minds.* Who now will wonder, that our Author should reproach us with an *amorous divinity*,* when some of the oracles of the Holy Ghost, *written after the manner of those in Asia*, are reckon'd by him unworthy to be publicly read? And herein perhaps he design'd to gratify some, who would fain have that Book excluded from the Canon of the Scriptures. But how could he tell, the minds of the *Jews* were better settled than ours? How did he know, this book might with less danger be read to them, than to our country men? A wicked mind has wicked inclinations. I should not scruple to affirm, that lessons taken out of it might be much more useful, than many of their Apocryphal ones.

But those parts of the Apocryphal writings which our Adversaries most carp at, are not wholly without excuse. Take the most exceptionable piece, Bel *and the* Dragon, *and let it pass for fabulous; yet still as a pious allegory, in fashion with the* Jews, *it may be retain'd.*

But yet it seems, the pious allegory of the Holy Spirit, *being writ after the fashion of those in Asia*, ought not to be retain'd. But what our Author would have retain'd, we must reject, if we will hearken to the Apostle. For of the same kind are those *Jewish, and old wives fables*, which he requires us to *refuse*.† And yet these, because *Jewish* forsooth, must now be retain'd; by which argument the reading all the ridiculous fables of the Rabbins may upon occasion be defended. That Book is indeed not only a fable, but a very foolish one, more adapted to provoke the hearers to laughter, than to stir them up to a good conversation. And yet this was first order'd to be a lesson by the wise Synod of 1662, who would rather make themselves ridiculous to all the world, than not offend the Dissenters. I wish our Adversaries would explain the hidden meaning of this pious allegory, that it might be made the more useful.

* *Page* 88. † Tit. i. 14. 1 Tim. iv. 7.

Nay, ſome very learned and wiſe men, viz. Irenæus, Tertullian, Cyprian, Nazianzen, *have aſſerted the truth of the plain matter of fact.* *

The three firſt of theſe, did not only think the Book to be true, but alſo Canonical. Wherefore, either their authority proves nothing in this caſe, or it proves too much. Now, that they all judg'd it Canonical, appears from their conſtant citing of it as the genuine work of the Prophet *Daniel*; for they us'd only the Seventies Tranſlation of the Old Teſtament, having no knowledge of the *Hebrew*. But our Author was careleſs in joining *Nazianzen* with them, who does not ſpeak of *Bell* and the *Dragon*, but of *Bell* and *Dagon*, and alludes to *Iſai.* xlvi. 1. and xxxiii. 9.

And tho' the Hiſtory of Suſannah *be the ſubject of their ſcoffs, yet St.* Jerom, *and* Origen, *writ Commentaries upon it.*† *Origen*, I grant, writ upon it; but *Africanus*, who liv'd at the ſame time, had a much meaner opinion of it.‖ But 'tis not fairly ſaid, *Jerom* writ Commentaries upon it. He tranſlated indeed thoſe of *Origen*, but did not write any himſelf. Hear what he ſays himſelf: "Having explain'd as well as "I could, what is contain'd in the Book of *Daniel*, accor- "ding to the *Hebrew*, I will now ſet down briefly what *Ori-* "*gen* ſays, in the tenth Book of his *Stromata*, concerning "the fables of *Suſannah* and *Bell*, and they are his words, "which you will find in their proper places." ‡ And whatever there is in that Commentary, that is not *Origen*'s, but *Jerom*'s, is wholly deſign'd as a confutation of the ſtory. So that 'twas not handſome in our Author to hale *Jerom*, ſo much againſt his inclination, over to his own ſide.

And that moſt antient writer St. Clement *quotes her as an admirable pattern of virtue.* *

Through the whole Epiſtle I find not the leaſt mention made of her. There ſeems to be an omiſſion here in the print. I am apt to ſuſpect the Doctor had ſaid ſomewhat of *Judith*, which was left out through the careleſneſs of the printer. And the name *Virago*, which he gives her, ſuits better with *Judith* than *Suſannah*. And *Judith* is indeed commended by *Clement*, in his Epiſtle. † Unleſs the conjecture of Mr. *Patrick Young*, and another learned man, whoſe Notes

---

* *Lib.* iv. *c.* 11. De Idol. *Lib.* i. *epiſt.* 4. & *lib.* iii. *epiſt.* 1. Adv. Jul. Orat. iv.
† *Vide* Comm. Hieron. ‖ Euſeb. H. E. *lib.* vi. *c.* 31. ‡ In Dan. xiii. 1.
* Idem. *Epiſt.* 1. *ad Cor.* † *Cap.* 55.

Notes are publiſh'd by Mr. *Le Clerc*, in his edition of the Apoſtolical Fathers, ſhould be here allow'd, who think the whole paſſage is foiſted in from *Clement* of *Alexandria*. But let us ſuppoſe that *Suſannah* was quoted by *Clement*. Will he hereby *demonſtrate, that in thoſe days this Book had its authority in the Church*? That it had equal authority with other prophane hiſtories, I will not deny. But he that would prove from *Clement*, that 'twas read in the Church, may, by the ſame argument, prove they read in the Church the ſtories of the *Danaides* and of *Dirce*, which he *quotes* in like manner; * and the writings of the *Sibyls*, which, it appears by an antient author, † were quoted by him, tho' we meet not now with the citation, the Epiſtle being imperfect. Nay, *Clement* in his ſecond Epiſtle (if it be his) *quotes* the *Goſpel* according to the *Egyptians*, ‖ which many others of the Fathers have done. Nor does *Tertullian* diſdain to borrow examples from the Gentiles, but propoſes *Lucretia*, *Mutius*, *Heraclitus*, *Dido*, &c. to Chriſtians, as patterns for their imitation. ‡ The Fathers did not perceive the fraud of that fable of *Judith*, which no body is now ignorant of. And Mr. *Limborch* very juſtly ſays of it: "It "ſeems to be writ by ſome *Jewiſh* trifler, who, without "any judgment, would needs write a Hiſtory for the com-"mendation of his own nation." *

In this, as well as other things, the great moderation of our Church is ſeen, which, not willing to deprive the flock of Chriſt of any Book which might ſerve to their edification, hath retain'd ſeveral Chapters of the Apocrypha to this purpoſe. If that be your mind, why are not *Clement*, *Hermas*, and ſeveral others, read in your Churches, as they were in antient times? But he adds a caution: *But yet, leſt ſhe ſhould ſeem to dote on them, as much as the Church of* Rome *doth, ſhe hath turn'd out of her Kalendar all thoſe parts which are groſly erroneous, that the people may not be miſled by the reading of them.* Who now can deny their great moderation is ſeen in this matter? Would you have me go to particulars? Why, they leave out *Tobit* v. becauſe it brings in the Angel telling a lie. But Chap. vi, and viii, which are magical, are read; and ſo is Chap. xii, Verſ. 12, 15. *Wiſd.* viii. 19, 20. not to mention other places, taken notice of in all Syſtems of

* *Cap.* 6. † Reſp. ad quæſt. 74 inter Juſtin. Opera. ‖ *Cap. ult. Vide* Cotel. not. in Loc. ‡ Ad Martyr. *c.* 4. * Theol. Chriſt. *lib.* i. *c.* 3. *ſect.* 9.

Divinity. And thus these men, if they throw any corruptions out of the worship of God, call it *great moderation*, tho' at the same time they retain, perhaps, those that are equally bad.

CHAP. XIV.

Of the Church's Homilies, and Ministers Sermons.

THERE is no need of treating largely of the *Homilies of the Church*, which are now but seldom read to the people. The late disuse of these is acknowledg'd, by such as are men of candor among our Adversaries, to be in a great measure owing to our Ministers. For, while they were industrious in their work, they not only provok'd them to diligence by their example, but in a manner forc'd them to preach often, lest they should render themselves contemptible in the eyes of the common people. The Apostle tells us, that a Minister of the Gospel must be *apt to teach*.* Wherefore, we think, they who are not able by their own study to teach the people the Christian faith and life, are to be kept out of the Ministry, as unworthy of it, unless no better can be had. Far be it from us, indeed, to blame our Reformers, for the pains they took in composing Homilies. The most miserable state religion was in at that time, when very few were found, who either could, or would instruct the people in sound doctrine, requir'd some such remedy. Nay, we think the doctrine of the Homilies is, in the main, very good. And tho' we look upon the Holy Scriptures as the only *touchstone, by which we are to try doctrines*; yet we cannot but so far agree with Dr. *Nichols*, as to wish they were more minded by *the people and the younger Clergy*.† For the divinity contain'd in the Homilies seems to us more consonant to the Scriptures, than that of many of our modern Sermons. For, indeed, they often endeavour to refute in their Sermons the doctrine they have subscrib'd in the Homilies and Articles. And yet, as some disagreeable things are to be met with in the Homilies, the Clergy (as it seems to us) are unreasonably requir'd to subscribe them.

I pro-

* 1 Tim. iii. 2. † *Page* 330.

I proceed now to their *Sermons*. And here I dont well underſtand what our Author means, when he reckons earneſtneſs in preaching to be uſeleſs and ſuperfluous. When he was before treating of Organs, and inſtrumental Muſic, he pretended there was a mighty virtue in them, to tame wild beaſts, and to warm and affect, nay, even to raviſh and tranſport men; whereupon he thus concludes: *Now ſince our Souls are ſo much accuſtom'd to worldly matters, as to be very cold and ſlow to the love of God, we have need of ſuch helps as theſe, to warm our affections, and put them in motion. By theſe we are diſpos'd to be importunate in our prayers for any divine favour*, &c.* But now by I know not what alteration it happens, that all theſe helps are wholly ſuperfluous, and there is no need to uſe any vehemence and earneſtneſs in ſpeaking, in order to work upon mens affections. *Their* [the antient orators] *great endeavour was to excite the attention, and work upon the paſſions of the judges, that they might have a perfect underſtanding of the cauſe, which otherwiſe did not concern them. But the things of the Chriſtian religion, which are the ſubjects of our Sermons, are of ſuch univerſal concern, and of ſuch weight and moment in themſelves, that if they are but clearly and diſtinctly propounded to mens underſtandings, they can hardly deny their aſſent to them. For what grace and beauty can be added to things divine, or who can amplify that which is infinite and eternal? The Chriſtian religion ſhines brighteſt in its own native dreſs, and to paint it, is but to deform it.*† This obſervation, which I have taken notice of before, is a moſt true and uſeful one, if there be any in all the Book; and, indeed, it refutes the greater part of it. For, all the *meretricious paint* (as he calls it) of civil honors confer'd upon the Biſhops, of Muſical inſtruments, of Garbs, Holidays, and all other ceremonies borrow'd from *Pagans*, *Papiſts*, or *Jews*, do but *deform* the Chriſtian religion. But this by the way: for the Doctor goes on: *Life eternal wants nothing to make it deſirable; and the leaſt ſerious thought of everlaſting puniſhment carries that horror in it, that all the figures and flowers of rhetoric are unneceſſary to the deſcription of it.* And why ſhould not this be own'd to be true in the buſineſs of prayer, wherein we pray that we may obtain *eternal life*, and eſcape *everlaſting puniſhment*? What need of ſo much ado, to ſtir mens

* *p.* 254, 255. † *Page* 331.

affections, which are mov'd enough of themselves by these important things? If our Author found his parishoners so very prone to think of everlasting concerns, he had an unusual happiness, which very few, if any faithful Ministers ever met with beside. Nay, according to his way of reasoning, Minister's sermons would become useless, since men may think at home of things *divine*, *infinite*, and *eternal*. There is a twofold design of sermons, to inform mens minds, and to move their affections; and an earnestness in preaching serves to promote both, as it tends to make the hearers the more attentive to what is said. They are therefore in the wrong, who would have these ornaments of speech laid aside. But let them hear what Bishop *Burnet* says, who is more to be regarded: "Man is a low sort of creature; he does not, nay, nor the greatest part cannot "consider things in themselves, without those seasonings "that must recommend them to their affections. That a "discourse be heard with any *life*, it must be spoken with "*some*; and the looks and motions of the eye do carry in "them such additions to what is said, that where these do "not at all concur, it has not all the force upon them, that "otherwise it might have." * He therefore sends preachers to *Tully*, *Quintilian*, &c. to learn from them the art of speaking.† I cannot here forbear mentioning *Quintilian*'s words, concerning the gestures of an orator. "'Tis no wonder, *says he*, if these things, which yet lie "in some motion, have so great an effect upon mens "minds; since a picture, which is a silent work, and al"ways appears the same, can so make its way to our "most inward affections, as that it shall seem sometimes "to surpass the force there is in speaking. On the other "hand, if the gesture and countenance suit not to the things "we are saying, and we speak merrily of melancholy sub"jects, and affirm any thing with the usual gesture of "denying, our words will not only carry no authority "with them, but even fail of being believ'd.------The "countenance, above all, bears rule. With this we in"treat, with this we threaten, with this we are sor"rowful, with this we are sad, with this we are bold, "with this we are submissive, upon this men depend, "this

* Pastoral Care, *p.* 230. *See also p.* 238. † *Ibid. p.* 125.

" this they look upon, this they obſerve, even before " we ſpeak, with this we love ſome, with this we hate " others, by this we underſtand many things, this is " many times inſtead of all words."*

I will here alſo add the judgment of Dr. *Edwards*: " This is an accompliſhment of the Miniſters of the Goſ- " pel, they preach ſo that their auditors may feel, as well " as hear them. Their pronunciation is not careleſs, fri- " gid, and languid; but lively, fervent, and powerful. " For they know [as Mr. *Herbert* ſaith] that *they procure* " *attention by earneſtneſs of ſpeech; it being natural to men* " *to think, that where there is much earneſtneſs, there is ſome-* " *what worth hearing.* ----- A main requiſite in an orator " was thought, by one of the eminenteſt men of that facul- " ty, to be *action*; and I do not ſee how it can be want- " ing in a preacher, who is the choiceſt of orators. Some " action ſhould at leaſt appear in him, ſome decent car- " riage, ſome grace in delivery; for this is a proper means " of affecting the minds of men. I could never approve " of thoſe pulpit men, who ſtand moveleſs in that place, " as if they were ty'd to the ſtake; a ſign that preaching " is a martyrdom to them."†

Theſe are the things which we commend in a preacher, nor do we deſire ſuch to obſerve any other directions, than what Biſhop *Burnet*, and Dr. *Edwards*, not only lay down in their writings, but alſo practis'd in their preaching, to the great advantage of their hearers. If there are any, who uſe an indecent geſture (as a man may err on that hand) I will not undertake to defend them. But they are in a worſe miſtake, who would have all action laid aſide in preaching, and that Miniſters ſhould read their ſermons with their eyes fix'd upon their notes, without ſo much as looking, it may be, on the people. Nor do we fear the judgment of our Brethren abroad in this matter.

The Doctor very weakly charges our predeceſſors with an affected way of preaching.‖ I grant they preach'd with life and ſpirit, and with a loud voice, if they had one; nor will any one in his wits blame them for it. We ſhould thank him for the great commendation he is pleas'd to give of the preſent ſet of Nonconformiſt Miniſters, were it not

* Inſtit. Orat. *lib.* xi. *c.* 3. † The Preacher, *part* i. *p.* 183, 184. ‖ *p.* 334.

manifeſtly done with a deſign of loading our anceſtors with the greater reproach. There is, indeed, a ſtrange levity and inconſtancy to be obſerv'd in our Adverſaries, who, according as they think it will be to their purpoſe, ſometimes, with Biſhop *Burnet*, * make our predeceſſors to have excell'd us; and ſometimes, with our Author, repreſent us as far ſurpaſſing them. Whom are we now to believe? I fear Biſhop *Burnet*'s account comes neareſt to the truth. But ſince our Adverſaries ſo highly commend, ſometimes our predeceſſors, and ſometimes us of the preſent generation; let our Brethren judge, upon what deſign, and by what right they caſt them out of their Communion, and ſhut the door againſt our return, by their paltry ceremonies, and their, at beſt, very doubtful ſubſcriptions.

Further, our Author very falſly repreſents us, as now diſeſteeming Mr. *Baxter*, and our other Divines of his time. That reverend perſon was very excellent in practical divinity, and the moſt happy and uſeful way of preaching; that I may ſay nothing of the extraordinary ſharpneſs and ſubtilty of his underſtanding. And, indeed, it would be very ſhameful in us, if we did not highly value and honor a perſon, ſo greatly commended by very conſiderable men of the Epiſcopal party, ſuch as, *Tillotſon*, *Stilling fleet*, *Barrow*, *Glanvil*, *Sherlock*, &c. Nay, we reckon him to have been one of the moſt valuable Divines of our nation, and his own time; than whom, unleſs we were much miſtaken, God has hardly honor'd any one Perſon, ſince the Reformation, to be a more ſucceſsful inſtrument to advance true piety. But 'tis needleſs to multiply words in his commendation, ſince his character is well known, not only at home, but to our Brethren abroad, from his moſt uſeful writings, tranſlated into many foreign languages. But the incurable wound that moſt pious perſons gave the *Engliſh* Hierarchy, and ceremonies, can never be forgiven. Hence are theſe whining complaints. For this reaſon they make ſuch an outcry, and endeavour to leſſen his reputation. And that our Adverſaries may not any longer impoſe upon themſelves with this pleaſant fancy, we let them know, we eſteem *Owen*, *Baxter*, *Bates*, *How*, *Charnock*, *Manton*, *Gilpin*, and many others, whom it would be tedious to reckon up, as ſome of the moſt excellent Divines of the laſt Century. We own

* Faſt. Serm. *p.* 204.

own there were many famous Divines alſo among the Churchmen; but doubt whether we agree with our Author in naming the perſons. But how did our Author know, we *take* our *way of reaſoning from the clear method of* their *Sharps* and *Tillotſons*?

I ſay nothing of Archbiſhop *Sharp*, few of whoſe writings I have ever ſeen. Archbiſhop *Tillotſon* is remarkable for an admirable ſtile, a ſolid confutation of the *Papiſts*, a clear and uſeful handling of the duties of natural religion; and, wherein I wiſh his example were more follow'd, an excellent moderate temper, which he very ſeldom fails to diſcover in his writings. But if a man would have an intire ſcheme of Chriſtianity, he muſt not, in my judgment, content himſelf with his writings alone. Dr. *Edwards* has ſufficiently evidenc'd this, by what he has lately ſaid upon that ſubject. His works are in every *Engliſh* reader's hands, and therefore I ſhall forbear tranſcribing much from him. I ſhall only take notice of one place, where he ſays, unleſs the Clergy mend their preaching, "Some are apt to think, "that there will be a neceſſity of repairing ſometimes to "other aſſemblies, beſides thoſe of their Church; that "perſons may have the whole of religion taught them." * And neither he, nor the Diſſenters, blame Miniſters for *preſſing moral virtues* in their ſermons, provided the other parts of the Chriſtian religion are not omitted. But 'tis no wonder many ſermons ſavour ſo little of Chriſtianity, when a ſyſtem of Divinity is very ſeldom, if ever, read to Students in our Univerſities: but after four years, ſpent in the ſtudy of Philology and Philoſophy, they are ſent abroad to undertake the care of pariſhes, when they have hardly enter'd upon the ſtudy of Divinity; or if they continue longer in the Univerſities, they muſt ſtudy Divinity by themſelves, without the aſſiſtance of a Tutor. And hence 'tis ſo common for our Adverſaries to contemn and undervalue the Profeſſors of the Univerſities abroad. †

CHAP.

* Preacher, *in the Pref. p.* 37. † *Vid. p.* 327. *Edit. Lat.*

CHAP. XV.

Of the Faults found with the Engliſh *Liturgy.*

I Have had occaſion already, in ſeveral places, to ſpeak of the faults of the Liturgy: I ſhall therefore treat of them but briefly in this place, ſince my work has already run to too great a length. Our Author mentions three ſeveral faults we find with it, which he afterwards diſtinctly endeavours to excuſe. How well he performs the taſk he undertakes, we ſhall conſider in ſpeaking to each.

The firſt fault then he ſpeaks of in the Liturgy is: *Becauſe the Lord's Prayer is repeated three or four times in the Service; this, they ſay, is like the Popiſh* Opus operatum; *'tis uſing vain repetitions in our prayer, and defiling the ſacred worſhip of God with impure ſuperſtition.* * And to this accuſation he thus anſwers: *But the reaſon why the Lord's Prayer is ſo often repeated in the ſame aſſembly is, becauſe ſeveral diſtinct Offices are put together,* viz. *Morning Prayer, the Litany, and the Communion Service, which are ſometimes us'd ſeparately; and for that reaſon the Church has provided, that we never ſhould break our Saviour's rule in our prayers, but uſe the form which he hath given us.* †

But this is a ſorry excuſe. For when two Offices are put together, why may not thoſe things, which are common to both, be left out in one or t'other of them? Let now any indifferent perſons judge, whether when that Prayer is repeated, as 'tis upon ſome occaſions, ſix times in one aſſembly, they dont ſin againſt that command of our Saviour: *But when ye pray, uſe not vain repetitions, as the Heathen do; for they think that they ſhall be heard for their much ſpeaking.* ‖ And if our Adverſaries had a mind to put twenty Offices together, the Lord's Prayer might by the ſame reaſon be repeated twenty times. But neither is this excuſe altogether true. For they always repeat it twice in the ſingle Office of Morning Prayer, as likewiſe in that of the Communion; nor is the Litany an office that is ever, as far as I know, ſaid by itſelf.

The

---

* *Page* 338. † *page* 339. ‖ Matth. vi. 7.

The second fault the Doctor mentions, is: *Because we pray to be deliver'd from* fornication, and all other deadly sin; *this*, they say, *is, with the* Papists, *to suppose, that there are some venial sins.* * His answer here is: *Fornication is call'd a mortal sin, both to shew the heinous nature of it, that it is peculiarly displeasing to God, and pernicious to our own souls; and likewise to correct the* Papists, *who reckon this among venial sins.* †

Protestant Divines have long ago exploded this distinction, the *Papists* have coin'd between *mortal* and *venial* sins. And since *death is the wages of* every *sin*, unless God's pardoning Grace prevent it, there is no reason, why that distinction should be again admitted. Hence the *Presbyterian* Ministers, in the Conference appointed by King *Charles* II. desir'd those words might be alter'd, and fornication might be rather call'd a *heinous*, than a *deadly* Sin. But the Episcopal Commissioners made conscience of not gratifying their Brethren in so small a request, altho' *Usher*, *Williams*, *Prideaux*, *Ward*, *Brownrigge*, *Featly*, and *Hacket*, who were most of them Bishops, had before given their advice for such an alteration; such a hatred had they, at that time, of peace. And however Dr. *Nichols* here pretends to justify the Church in this particular, yet 'tis plain he did not think we found fault without a cause. For speaking of that conference, upon another occasion, he very honestly tells us: "The Bishops were not very forward to make any "alterations, which were proposed by the *Presbyterians*, "even in some things as might have deserv'd consideration; "refusing them so much as the change of *deadly sin*, into "*heinous sin.*" || Now we are the rather desirous of this alteration, because we observe several of the Church Ministers do, in their writings, openly abet and defend that distinction.

But I proceed to the third fault. *Because*, says he, *in the Office of burial, we pray, That* when we depart this life, we may rest in Christ, as our hope is, this our brother doth. *This*, say they, *is commonly to lie to the Spirit of God, and to promise the kingdom of Heaven to the children of the Devil.* ‡ But this objection he hopes easily to get over, thus: *According to the rules of Christian charity, we hope for the salvation of every deceased*

*

* *Page* 338. † *Page* 339. || Comment on the Common Prayer. Pref. *p.* 9. ‡ *Page* 338.

deceased person, who dies within the pale of the Church; as thinking, we cannot, without the greatest arrogance, exclude any, in our private judgment, from the common reward of Christians, whom the Church hath not thought fit to exclude by her public censure. *

I am utterly ignorant what those *rules of Christianity* are, which require us to *hope* thus concerning men, who were, it may be, notorious for all manner of wickedness. The Spirit of God testifies, that *the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God.* † How then can we hope, that such are made partakers of the eternal inheritance, provided only they died not under the Church's censure? How many wicked wretches are daily buried, who, as they gave no signs of so much as a death bed repentance, have left us no room for such a hope in their case? To require Ministers to express such a hope, is as wicked, as 'tis absurd. Nay, if we suppose the case to be doubtful, what occasion is there to say any thing about it? But profligate wretches meet with that charity among our Adversaries, which several of the furious High blades refuse to shew to any Dissenters. Nor can it be express'd how great mischief has been done to religion, by the promiscuous use of this form in burying the dead. Men are easily harden'd in their impieties, when they hear such hope is entertain'd of those that liv'd and died like themselves. If it was left to a Minister's discretion, to express this charitable hope of the dead he buries, or not to express it, according as he saw there was reason, it would be quite another case. But since they are requir'd always to say the same, of all those that have been baptiz'd, and did not die excommunicate, or by laying violent hands on themselves, we cannot oblige ourselves to conform to such a custom. But let this matter be judg'd by the words of the Liturgy: "For as much as it hath pleased Almighty God, of his "great mercy, to take unto himself the soul of our dear "brother here departed, we therefore commit his body to "the ground; earth to earth, ashes to ashes, dust to dust, "in sure and certain hope of the resurrection to eternal "life, through our Lord Jesus Christ, who shall change "our vile body, &c.——Almighty God, with whom live "the spirits of them that depart hence in the Lord, and "with

* Page 339. † 1 Cor. vi. 9.

" with whom the ſouls of the faithful, after they are de-
" liver'd from the burden of the fleſh, are in joy and feli-
" city; we give thee hearty thanks, for that it hath pleaſed
" thee to deliver this our brother, out of the miſeries of
" this ſinful world, *&c.*------ We meekly beſeech thee, O
" Father, to raiſe us from the death of ſin, unto the life
" of righteouſneſs; that when we ſhall depart this life,
" we may reſt in him [*Chriſt*] as our hope is, this our bro-
" ther doth." Theſe are the words to be ſaid of every one that's buried, and which our author has undertaken to defend; but which to us appear to be ſuch as would juſtify our Separation, if we diſlik'd nothing elſe. Nor can our Adverſaries agree with one another in this matter. For in the *Savoy Conference*, they refus'd to make any deſir'd alterations in the Office, and gave this reaſon for it: " We ſee
" not why theſe words may not be ſaid of any perſon,
" whom we dare not ſay is damn'd; and it were a breach
" of charity to ſay ſo, even of thoſe, whoſe repentance
" we do not ſee: for whether they do not inwardly and
" heartily repent, even at the laſt act, who knows? And
" that God will not, even then, pardon them upon ſuch
" repentance, who dares ſay?"* And yet Dr. *Pain*, and many other of their Divines, ſtiffly deny that any ſuch late repentance can be true, and ſaving.

So much for the faults of the Liturgy, here mention'd by our Author. From what has been ſaid, *the whole Reform'd world*, to whoſe judgment he ſubmits the matter in the end of the Chapter, may now decide between us, whether we have not juſtly found fault with theſe things, notwithſtanding what Dr. *Nichols* has alledg'd to the contrary. The reſt of this Chapter is ſpent in running over the ſeveral parts of the Liturgy; that ſo it may appear, forſooth, *how much* their *Liturgy excels all others, either in the antient, or the preſent Church.* † But if a man were inclin'd thoroughly to examine all the parts and members of this exquiſite body of prayers (as our Adverſaries eſteem it) 'twere eaſy to ſhew that each of them has its defects and blemiſhes. But for the reaſon I gave before, I ſhall content my ſelf with only a few brief remarks.

The *Confeſſion*, which our Author ſo highly extols, is too ſhort and general, and ſeems not well adapted to an-

* ſwer

* Hiſt. of Nonconformity. *p.* 723. † *Page* 340.

ſwer the end of confeſſion, that is, to promote the contrition of the heart. And tho' *very heinous particular* ſins, of which the aſſembly has not been guilty, are not to be brought into a public confeſſion; yet there are many offences, which all are chargeable with, and ought therefore to be more particularly inſiſted on in that part of the Service. The Church of *England* holds the doctrine of original ſin; nay more, that *Adam's ſin is imputed to all his poſterity*, as our Author informs us. * Why then ſhould not original ſin be taken into their confeſſion; eſpecially, ſince it ſerves to ſhew the neceſſity of the mercy of God obtain'd for us by the blood of Chriſt?

The *alternate reciting of the Pſalms* † is no where commanded by the Church, but has crept in by an evil cuſtom. The Miniſter's part may be eaſily underſtood, but the confus'd noiſe of the people is hardly intelligible. Further, the Pſalms they read are not thoſe of the laſt tranſlation, made from the *Hebrew*; but an old one, agreeable to that of the Seventy, in which ſome things are improperly, nay, and very badly render'd. But they expect allowances herein, to be made them upon the account of their deference and love to antiquity.

The repeating the Creed always at the Communion began not before the middle of the fifth Century, and was the Contrivance of *Peter Fullo*, an Heretic, as *Theodorus Lector* tells us. ‖ This I take notice of for the ſake of thoſe who are Lovers of antiquity; becauſe Dr. *Nichols* has ſaid nothing of the antiquity, or Author of this practice.

The Litany is made up of a great many little ſhort prayers, heap'd up together, without any great matter of order. ‡ Theſe petitions are pronounc'd, partly by the Miniſter, and partly by the people, who ſometimes divide one ſhort ſentence between them. But I will preſent our Arbitrators with a part of the Litany, that they may the better judge, whether our Adverſaries are guilty of thoſe *vain repetitions* condemn'd by our Saviour, or not. "*Min.* "Son of God, we beſeech thee to hear us. *Anſw.* Son "of God, we beſeech thee to hear us. *Min.* O Lamb of "God, that takeſt away the ſins of the world; *Anſw.* "Grant us thy peace. *Min.* O Lamb of God, that takeſt "away the ſins of the world; *Anſw.* Have mercy upon us. "*Min.*

---

* Vide *p.* 209. † *Page* 341. ‖ H. E. *lib.* ii. *p.* 566. ‡ *Page* 342.

" *Min.* O Christ, hear us. *Answ.* O Christ, hear us. " *Min.* Lord, have mercy upon us. *Answ.* Lord, have " mercy upon us. *Min.* Christ, have mercy upon us. " *Answ.* Christ, have mercy upon us. *Min.* Lord, have " mercy upon us. *Answ.* Lord, have mercy upon us. *Min.* " Our Father which art in heaven, *&c.*" In so few words as these, *have mercy upon us* is seven times repeated; and *hear us* four times, tho' it had been repeated above twenty times before, in the former part of the same Office. And who can now help *opening his eyes, and seeing how much this Liturgy excels all others, either in the antient, or the present Church*? We dont at all blame the reiterated petitions of a devout soul, that arise from a more vehement and extraordinary affection. But, to speak the truth, I hardly think this depends upon our own pleasure, but proceeds from that Spirit of supplication, who acts of his own good pleasure. Altho' we are to endeavour to stir up our souls to the most fervent desires, as often as we pray; yet good men experience themselves sometimes favour'd with a more than ordinary aid of the Spirit in their private devotions: and hence they do well to redouble their petitions. But I dont yet understand, how our advocates for the Liturgy can be certain the assembly shall be favour'd with such extraordinary desires at the precise time, when these repetitions are prescrib'd, rather than any other, wherein the same or such like things are pray'd for by them.

CHAP. XVI.

Of the Discipline of the Church of England.

OUR Adversaries are very angry at our complaints of their want of ecclesiastical Discipline; altho' some of the most considerable men among themselves, acknowledge there is too much reason for them. Our Author boldly *appeals to all impartial judges, whether they ever knew any wiser government in the whole Christian world:* * notwithstanding, he here in the beginning of this Chapter, grants 'tis defective. *They may*, says he, *be pleas'd to understand, that our Discipline, tho' short of what good men wish for, yet is the best we can have in these miserable divisions of the Church.* †

Dr.

* *Vide page* 347. † *page* 344.

Dr. *Whitby* takes notice by the by, that the Church of *England* obſerves no Church Diſcipline.* And the Liturgy it ſelf teaches them, once a year, to wiſh the godly diſcipline of the primitive Church reſtor'd. I have alſo taken notice already, from Biſhop *Burnet*, how very corrupt their preſent Diſcipline is. And I ſuppoſe, 'twill pleaſe the reader to hear what the ſame excellent perſon's judgment was concerning that matter, in one of the laſt works he publiſh'd. " The *proviſo*, *ſays he*, that had paſs'd in K. *Henry* the Eighth's " time, that continu'd all the Canon law then receiv'd " in *England*, till a Code of Eccleſiaſtical laws was pre- " par'd (which, tho' attempted, and well prepar'd, was " never ſettled) has *fix'd among us many groſs abuſes*, beſide " the *dilatory forms* of thoſe Courts, which make all pro- " ceedings in them both flow and chargeable. This has " in a great meaſure enervated all Church Diſcipline. A " faint wiſh, that is read on *Aſh-Wedneſday*, intimates a de- " ſire of reviving the antient Diſcipline; yet no progreſs " has been made to render that more effectual. The ex- " emptions ſettled by the Papal authority do put many " parts of this Church in a very disjointed ſtate: while " in ſome places the Laity, and in many others Presbyters " exerciſe epiſcopal juriſdiction, independant on their Bi- " ſhops, in contradiction to their principles: while they " aſſert a divine right for ſettling the government of the " Church in Biſhops, and yet practiſe Epiſcopal authority " in the virtue of an act of Parliament, that proviſionally " confirm'd thoſe Papal invaſions of the Epiſcopal power; " which is plainly that, which by a modern name is cal- " led *Eraſtianiſm*, and is ſo ſeverely cenſur'd by ſome who " yet practiſe it; ſince whatever is done under the pre- " tence of law, againſt the divine appointment, can go " under no better name, than the higheſt and worſt de- " gree of *Eraſtianiſm*. †

But to return to Dr. *Nichols*: What are thoſe *miſerable diviſions of the Church*, which hinder the reſtoring Diſcipline? Certainly, they are not ſo much thoſe between them and us, as thoſe among themſelves. If all the Epiſcoparians were agreed, why might they not be able to recover the antient form of Diſcipline? the pious part of the Clergy, among whom the Doctor doubtleſs made one, earneſtly

* Upon Rom. xiv. 6. † Hiſt Refor. *part* iii. *p.* 330.

earneſtly deſire it, and perhaps carefully endeavour it; but ſuch deſigns are hinder'd by others, who, not without cauſe, are afraid of them. If the true eccleſiaſtical Diſcipline were once ſet up, I make no doubt, our controverſy would ſoon be ended. For whenſoever our merciful Father ſhall pleaſe, by his Holy Spirit, to ſtir up the Churchmen to mend their Diſcipline; he will, without queſtion, infuſe into them, at the ſame time, ſuch a Spirit of love and peace, as will effectually put an end to their childiſh fondneſs for trifles. Which if once it happens; what ſhall be able to prevent our being united? As to the Diſſenters, they neither are, nor can be a hindrance to the reſtauration of the antient Diſcipline. 'Tis not long of us, that they can't govern their own Members, hold Synods, lay aſide their bad Canons, and make new ones. We greatly long to ſee that happy day: God grant it may be haſten'd. I confeſs, they labour under this one inconvenience, that they can make no eccleſiaſtical laws without the conſent of the government; but that is not owing to us, but to the conſtitution of their Church. And yet, who can imagine the government would be againſt ſo good a thing as the reſtoring Diſcipline, if they did but ſee it were heartily deſir'd by the greater part of the Clergy? But there is too much reaſon to fear the Clergy will never move at all in this work, unleſs the Parliament firſt take it in hand of their own accord. But our Author goes on:

If all things were compos'd and quiet amongſt us, then we could eaſily apply new laws to the reſtraining of growing evils. But in our preſent troubleſome circumſtances, it is thought by moſt intelligent perſons too raſh an attempt to ſtir the old foundations.

But what if theſe *troubleſome circumſtances* are the puniſhment of your ſin, in neglecting and deſtroying Church Diſcipline, and God is hereby calling you to reſtore it? If that conjecture is not improbable, how vainly are theſe troubleſome circumſtances alledg'd as an excuſe? Certainly, no man ſhould ever do evil, that good may come of it. And if our Adverſaries acknowledge the neceſſity of that Diſcipline, the want of which they lament, why have they not as yet attempted to ſet it up? Why dont they uſe as much Diſcipline, as they ſee we do, notwithſtanding theſe troubleſome circumſtances? Why dont they, as well as we, keep Heretics and profligate ſinners from their Communion? They are afraid, it may be, they ſhould come over to us, when they reject them. But if it ſhould prove

ſo, what hurt would it do the Church? The happineſs of the Church depends more upon the holineſs, than the number of her members. And why may not we as well fear the ſame thing? But, indeed, that fear is cauſeleſs; for we ſhould admit no ſuch to our Communion, unleſs they mend their manners.

Our Author hitherto has been owning the defects of their Diſcipline; which any one would gueſs, by his words, was in a very wretched and deplorable condition. But now, as tho' he repented of his conceſſion, he pretends their Diſcipline, with all its faults, is equal to that of any other Church whatever. For thus he diſcourſes in the words that immediately follow: *However, our preſent ſtate of Diſcipline deſerves ſo little to be deſpis'd or charg'd with any flagrant diſorder, that 'tis not a jot inferior to the compleateſt rules of other Churches, as every impartial judge muſt needs grant.* He is a great ſtranger to the foreign Churches, who is not acquainted with the exact order of their Conſiſtories, Claſſes, and Synods. By theſe a remedy is preſently apply'd to any growing evils, and the good of the Church taken care of; and as ſoon as any ſcandal is given, either by mens manners, or opinions, it preſently meets with a juſt cenſure. But every creature likes its own offspring beſt. And we have had occaſion more than once, to take notice of this vain humour of our Adverſaries, who take all opportunities of extolling every thing that belongs to themſelves, and never vouchſafe in any thing to come behind other men. We ſhall preſently ſee what ground our Author had to give his own Church's Diſcipline the preference, when we go over the ſeveral parts of it. But firſt let us hear what he ſays:

All England *is divided into about ten thouſand pariſhes; over every one of which, there preſides a Rector or Vicar, who has authority to preach the word of God, and adminiſter the Sacraments.* We are here eſpecially to obſerve, how theſe *Rectors* or *Vicars* come by their parochial Cures, according to the Diſcipline of the Church of *England*. The pariſhioners in a very few places have that power, which, *Cyprian* ſays, belongs chiefly to the people, *of chuſing worthy Prieſts*, or *refuſing thoſe that are unworthy*. If a new Rector is to be plac'd in a pariſh, the Patron of the living writes a letter to the Biſhop, and recommends what Clergyman he pleaſes to be put into it. The Biſhop cannot refuſe the perſon thus recommended; and ſo the pariſhioners, whether they will

or

or no, are committed to the care of that Presbyter, chosen by a stranger, and it may be, a notoriously wicked person. It might perhaps seem incredible abroad, if I should assert, that in the Church of *England*, the best reform'd Church, as they themselves boast, in the world, whose *present state of Discipline is not a jot inferior to the compleateſt rules of other Churches*, the right of patronage is bought and sold; and that 'tis not reckon'd Simony, nor any crime at all, for a person to buy that right, or the next presentation of a living, provided it be not void at the time. Hence ignorant fellows, if they are but rich, often get the fatteſt Benefices. And when they have got the livings, they are not bound to take care of the flock themselves; 'tis enough if they leave so troublesome a work to any sorry Curate, who will do it cheapeſt. Nay, sometimes the Minister shall have the income of two, three, or more parishes, who will not vouchsafe to take the pastoral care of one. Hence our Author us'd a caution in his own expression; making the number of Rectors and Vicars *almoſt* as great as that of Parishes. We have already heard Bishop *Burnet*'s grievous complaint of this matter; out of whom I shall now add a little more. " But what can we say, when we find " often the pooreſt Clerks in the richeſt livings? whose " Incumbents, not content to devour the patrimony of the " Church, *while they feed themselves, and not the flock* out of " it, are so scandalously hard in their allowance to their " Curates, as if they intended equally to starve both Curate " and people. * —— We ought to reflect on those words " of the Prophet, and see how far they are applicable to " us: *The Prieſt's lips should keep knowledge, and they should* " *seek the law at his mouth, for he is the meſſenger of the Lord* " *of hosts. But ye are departed out of the way, ye have caused* " *many to stumble at the law. Therefore have I also made you* " *contemptible and base before all the people; according as ye have* " *not kept my ways, but have been partial in my law.*" † Further, they who have procur'd themselves Benefices, may, in a manner, live as they please. Several of our present Bishops, of eminent learning and piety, who would be glad to proceed against vicious Clergymen, and turn them out of their livings, find themselves hinder'd by our laws from doing it. Hence our nation abounds with dissolute Clergy-

* Pastoral Care; *Prēf. pag.* 26. † Mal. ii. 7, 8.

men, the ſhame of their country, and the holy function. But let us hear how Biſhop *Burnet* ſpeaks of this matter: "It may ſeem a conſideration too full of ill nature, of "emulation, and of jealouſy, if I ſhould urge upon the "Clergy the diviſions and ſeparation that is form'd "among us; tho' there is a terrible word in the Prophet, "that belongs, but too evidently, to this likewiſe: *The "paſtors are become brutiſh, and have not ſought the Lord; there-"fore they ſhall not proſper, and all their flocks ſhall beſcatter'd.** "If we led ſuch exemplary lives, as became our character; "if we apply'd ourſelves wholly to the duty of our pro-"feſſion; if we ſtudy'd to outlive, and outlabour thoſe "that divide from us; we might hope, by the bleſſing of "God, ſo far to overcome their prejudices, and to gain "both upon their eſteem and affections, that a very ſmall "matter might go a great way towards the healing of "thoſe wounds, which have ſo long weaken'd and "diſtracted us." † But I proceed to the offices of theſe Rectors, who, our Author tells us, have *paſtoral* (as 'tis in the *Latin*) *authority to adminiſter the Sacraments:* But what kind of paſtoral authority can theirs be; if, as many affirm, the Biſhop is the only Paſtor of his Dioceſs? Beſides, how can they be ſaid to have paſtoral authority, who have no power to keep notorious ſinners from the Sacrament for above fourteen days, unleſs he will put him into the Spiritual Court, and be at a great charge? Nay, a man for refuſing to give the Sacrament to a wicked wretch, (as in caſe it be to qualify him for an office) may incur a prodigious penalty. Another part of their office is: *To catechiſe the children:* Which was formerly, during the tyranny of Archbiſhop *Laud*, only to hear them repeat the anſwers in the Catechiſm; for it was not lawful then to give any explication of it. But we are glad our Adverſaries are, ſince that time, conſiderably alter'd in this reſpect. They are likewiſe, *To preach a Sermon on Sundays, if they are licenced thereto*, (for ſo our Author truly expreſſes it) as tho' all Presbyters, who adminiſter the Sacraments, had not a power to preach. So much is the method alter'd ſince the Apoſtles days. St. *Paul* would have only ſuch, as are *apt to teach*, ordain'd Presbyters; but now, if a man can read Prayers and Homilies, he may be admitted to the office of

* Jer. x. 21. † Paſtoral care, *Pref. p.* 29.

of a Presbyter, tho' he is not capable of preaching. The laws of the Church are certainly too loose in this matter; since a Bishop is allow'd to ordain any person, if he has a presentation to a living, understands *Latin*, and is not scandalous. * The Rectors are not oblig'd to preach more than once on the Lord's Day, and in many parishes they have no afternoon Sermons. † Lastly, they are oblig'd to obey the orders of the Ecclesiastical Courts, and to publish in their congregrations the Lay Chancellors's sentences of Excommunication, which are often pass'd upon very frivolous occasions. For they are unworthy, with all their *pastoral authority*, to be judges of the offences committed; nor are they in any thing allow'd to use their own judgment; but are bound, with an implicit faith, to take the sentences of Excommunication, which mercenary men pronounce to be good, and as such to publish them to the congregation.

The Dr. next treats of the *Parishioners*. ‖ These within our remembrance were bound by a very severe discipline, to frequent their own parish Churches, altho' they chanc'd to live at a distance from them, and in the neighbourhood of other Churches. All likewise above sixteen years old, be their faith or morals what they will, were requir'd to receive the Lord's Supper. No one could then *buy or sell*, or almost live, if he dislik'd the *English* Service, according to that laudable example, as it was then reckon'd, *Rev.* xiii. 17. But this Discipline is happily fallen to the ground, tho' to the great regret of our High Churchmen. Nor are the Holidays, here mention'd by our Author, much valu'd, there being very few of the people who keep them.

I shall add nothing concerning the *Bishops*, having largely treated of them already.

The *Archdeacons*, who are meer Presbyters, ought not, according to our Adversaries opinion concerning Bishops, to have any jurisdiction. ‡ And indeed I believe 'twas unheard of in the antient Church, that any *Presbyter* should be call'd an *Archdeacon*. They had not then learnt to speak so improperly. I dont deny that name to have been us'd in the fourth Century. *Jerom* mentions an Archdeacon, who belong'd to *John* the Bishop of *Jerusalem*. * But such then

* Can. 34. † Can 45. ‖ *page* 345. ‡ *page* 346. * Epist. lxi. ad Pamach.

were Deacons, and not Presbyters; as appears by another letter of *Jerom*. " If, *says he*, the Deacons chuse one of " their own number, whom they know to be industrious, " and call him an *Archdeacon*. *

The Bishops have their Archbishops over them, not only against *Cyprian*'s judgment, who expresly denies any one to be *the Bishop of Bishops*; but against the opinion of many Episcoparians. But we need not wonder, that such a number of contrivances should be needful to patch up a Discipline, that varies so much from its first and most perfect institution.

Of the *King* and his power I have said enough in the First Part, in answer to the *Introduction*. †

Now our Author *appeals to all impartial judges, whether they ever knew any wiser government in the whole Christian world*? And in like manner I appeal to them, whether they know a worse in the Reform'd world? I wish these vain glorious defenders of the Hierarchy would mind the excellent admonition given them by Bishop *Burnet*. " 'Tis " not our boasting that the Church of *England* is the best " Reform'd, and the best constituted Church in the whole " world, that will signify much to convince others: we " are too much parties to be believ'd in our own cause. " There was a generation of men that cry'd: *The Temple of* " *the Lord, the Temple of the Lord*, as loud as we can cry, " *The Church of* England, *the Church of* England; when by " their sins they were pulling it down, and kindling that " fire which consum'd it. It will have a better grace " to see others boast of our Church, from what they ob- " serve in us, than for us to be crying it up in our words, " when our deeds do decry it. Our enemies will make " severe inferences from them; and our pretensions will be " thought vain and impudent things, as long as our lives " contradict them." ‖ Nor will it be foreign to my purpose, to present my reader with the complaint of a high Churchman, concerning this matter. " Discipline, *says* " *he*, is lost, and will not be permitted by the state; " which by virtue of *Conge d' Eslire's*, *Quare Impedits*, *Probi-* " *bitions*, &c. have made themselves the sole and ultimate " judges, not only of all Bishops and Churches; but of " their

* Epist. ad Evagr. † *page* 347. ‖ Past. Care. *Pref. p.* 32.

" their Excommunications, and every exercise of their spi-
" ritual jurisdiction. * —— An action lies against the
" Minister, who shall refuse it [the Sacrament] to them;
" tho' he knows, sees, and hears them, in their conver-
" sation and principles, to be never so much unqualify'd? †
This is the Discipline of the Church of *England*, so highly commended by some; which yet many of the Episcoparians themselves blush at, as the disgrace of the Reformation.

But our Author goes on in the praise of their Discipline: *Our Church is not without her good laws for the advancement of piety, and the suppression of ill manners. For, according to our Canons, all spreaders of heretical, corrupt doctrines, are to be excommunicated.* ‖ It would be tedious to give an account of all the several things, for which men are order'd by the Canons to be *ipso facto* excommunicated; I will however, for the sake of the reader, mention some of them.

" Whosoever shall hereafter affirm, that the form of
" God's worship in the Church of *England*, establish'd by
" law, and contain'd in the Book of Common Prayer and
" administration of Sacraments, is a corrupt, superstiti-
" tious, or unlawful worship of God, or containeth any
" thing in it that is repugnant to the Scriptures: let him
" be excommunicated *ipso facto*, and not restor'd but by
" the Bishop of the place, or Archbishop, after his repen-
" tance, and public revocation of such his wicked errors. ‡

" Whosoever shall hereafter affirm, that any of the nine
" and thirty Articles agreed upon by the Archbishops and
" Bishops of both Provinces, and the whole Clergy in the
" Convocation holden at *London*, in the year of our Lord
" God 1562, for avoiding diversities of opinions, and for
" the establishing of consent touching true religion, are
" in any part superstitious or erroneous, or such as he may
" not with a good conscience subscribe unto: let him be
" excommunicated *ipso facto*, &c. *

" Whosoever shall hereafter affirm, that the rites and
" ceremonies of the Church of *England* by law establish'd,
" are wicked, Antichristian, or superstitious; or such as be-
" ing commanded by lawful authority, men who are zea-
" lously and godly affected, may not with any good con-

* Case of the Regal. & Pontif. *p.* 166. † Ibid *p.* 179. ‖ *Page* 348.
‡ Can. iv. 1603. * Can. v.

" science approve them, use them, or as occasion requireth " subscribe unto them: * Whosoever shall hereafter affirm, " that the Government of the Church of *England* under " his Majesty, by Archbishops, Bishops, Deans, Archdea- " cons, and the rest that bear office in the same, is Anti- " christian, and repugnant to the word of God: † Who- " soever shall hereafter affirm, that such Ministers as " refuse to subscribe to the form and manner of God's " worship in the Church of *England*, prescrib'd in the " Communion Book, and their adherents, may truly " take upon them the name of another Church not " establish'd by law, and dare presume to publish it, " that this their pretended Church hath of a long time " groan'd under the burthen of certain grievances impos'd " upon it, and upon the members thereof before mention'd, " by the Church of *England*, and the orders and constitu- " tions therein by law establish'd: || Whosoever shall here- " after affirm or maintain, that there are within this " realm other meetings, assemblies, or congregations, of " the King's born subjects, than such as by the laws of " this land are held and allow'd, which may rightly chal- " lenge to themselves the name of true and lawful Churches. ‡ " Whosoever shall hereafter affirm, that 'tis lawful for any " sort of Ministers and Lay persons, or of either of them, " to join together, and make rules, orders or constitutions " in causes ecclesiastical, without the King's authority, and " shall submit themselves to be rul'd and govern'd by " them." * All these are by those Canons *ipso facto* excommunicated.

'Tis therefore certain all the Dissenters in *England* are *ipso facto* excommunicated. But we do not much fear their excommunication, now the law has taken off the edge of it; however, we cannot but wonder they should make such heavy complaints of our leaving them, when they have with so many bitter curses cast us out. Further, since Dr. *Nichols* gives many of our Ministers so good a character for their piety, he must of necessity own the Canons of his Church, whereby she excludes them from her communion, to be very unjust. Hence our Brethren abroad may easily see, what the Church's laws are, and what piety they serve to *advance*, viz. that which is describ'd by the Apostle, *James* iii. 14, 15. under the name of *bitter envying*

* Can. vi. † Can. vii. || Can. x. ‡ Can. xi. * Can. xi.

ing and *ſtrife*. But while they treated the Puritans with ſo great rigor and ſeverity, they dealt moſt gently and tenderly with thoſe who were led away with the puny, and almoſt harmleſs miſtakes of the Papiſts; as we may ſee by another Canon of the ſame Synod. "Every Miniſter being a "preacher, and having any popiſh recuſant or recuſants "in his pariſh, and thought fit by the Biſhop of the Dio- "ceſs, ſhall labour diligently with them from time to time, "thereby to reclaim them from their errors. And if he be "no preacher, or not ſuch a preacher, then he ſhall pro- "cure, if he can poſſibly, ſome that are preachers ſo qua- "lify'd, to take pains with them for that purpoſe. If he "can procure none, then he ſhall inform the Biſhop of the "Dioceſs thereof; who ſhall not only appoint ſome neigh- "bouring preacher, or preachers adjoining, to take that "labour upon them, but himſelf alſo (as his important "affairs will permit him) ſhall uſe his beſt endeavours, "by inſtruction, perſwaſion, and all good means he can "deviſe, to reclaim both them and all other within his "Dioceſs ſo affected." * I am far from diſliking the Canon; but I think we had as much reaſon as the Papiſts to expect ſuch gentle uſage.

But let us now return to our Author: *If men live in any notorious ſin, they are to be kept from the holy Sacrament.* He ſhould have added too from the xxvii *Canon*: "If any will "not kneel in receiving the Sacrament, or are common and "notorious depravers of their rites and ceremonies, or any "thing contain'd in the Articles." And how they are to be kept from the Sacrament, I ſhew'd before.

All Perſons of a ſufficient age, [*that is*, the age of ſixteen] *who do not communicate at* Eaſter, *ſhall be cited into the Spiritual Court, to be puniſh'd for neglecting their Chriſtian duty.* This piece of Diſcipline is now laid aſide; nor is any inquiry made into this matter ſince the *Toleration*, which deliver'd the Diſſenters from the clutches of the Chancellors, Apparitors, &c. And while ſuch Diſcipline was uſed, it gave great occaſion for profaning the holy Sacrament. For profligate wretches then, out of the fear of puniſhment, went to the Sacrament, without any care to prepare themſelves, and to live according to the rules of our holy religion.

I ſay

* Can. lxvi.

I say nothing of *Churchwardens*, because they are now, for the reason just mention'd, at little trouble to *return the names of loose and scandalous livers into the Bishop's Court*; where yet, for ought I can understand, the Bishop has not much to do.

Now if the party accused be convicted of the crime before the judge, he is excommunicated, and not admitted to the Sacrament, or any communion in divine offices. * There are now very few examples of this nature, tho' wickedness abounds every where.

Crimes of a very high nature are punished with the greater excommunication, whereby the offender is cut off from commerce with Christians even in temporal affairs. So that the poor creatures must necessarily and miserably perish, if the orders of the Church were universally observ'd in such cases; since no one in the nation might sell them food, raiment, or any convenience whatever.

If the excommunicated person obstinately persists for XL *days, the King's writ sends him to prison, where he is to continue till he makes satisfaction for his offence by Penance and humble submission.* Our Adversaries herein follow the base example of the Papists, who call in the aid of the secular power, and so inforce their ecclesiastical censures. But this cannot seem strange, since Dr. *Nichols* confirms for the most part what he says upon this head by the Popish Constitutions, which were made before the Reformation. So that he has very highly applauded the Popish Discipline, as well as that of the Church of *England*. 'Tis indeed the magistrate's part to appoint penalties for whatever is prejudicial to the commonwealth. But to cast men out of the Church, and deliver them to be punish'd by the magistrate, either for frivolous matters, or for such opinions as no way concern the state, is very unjust, and as contrary as any thing can be to the Christian religion, and the mind of our Saviour, who would never have his religion spread by these *Mahometan* methods. Besides, what advantage can be expected by such kind of punishments, but the extorting from offenders an hypocritical profession of repentance? And that is what Pastors should rather discourage, than force men to.

We are so far from disliking the practice of requiring a public declaration of repentance from delinquents, that we hear-

* *Pag.* 349.

heartily wish it were more frequent; but to have this turn'd into a money business, seems to me shameful and scandalous. But our Author acknowledges, that so it is in the Church of *England*: *Persons of a superior rank, whose honor would suffer by a public Penance, are allow'd to ransom themselves from the reproach of it, by a good round sum of money, to be bestow'd either upon the poor, or upon the buildings of the Church.* * If the case be as he says, our Adversaries are deservedly tax'd, as guilty of that *respect of persons*, which the Apostle condemns, *Jam.* ii. 1, 2, 3, 4, 9. where Dr. *Hammond* and Dr. *Whitby* tell us, he has respect to Consistories for judicature. And by what authority of the primitive Church will they defend themselves in this practice? There is not a syllable of pecuniary punishments in any antient Father. *Ambrose* was ignorant of this cunning device of *commutation of Penance*, who, without regard to the honor of the Emperor *Theodosius*, turn'd him out of the Church, and forc'd him to confess his sin publicly in the Church; if we may believe *Sozomon*, who relates the story.† But the respect to money is, in this case, greater than that to persons. Whence, if a man has ready money to lay down, he may be secure of an easy absolution. Which the Dissenters learnt by experience, in the persecution that raged in the reigns of the two Brothers; when *good round sums of money* were squeez'd out of them, to be *bestow'd upon the poor* Judges of the Spiritual Courts, who then made haste to be rich. But let us hear the rest:

If there be any fraud or neglect in these things, 'tis owing to the corruption and knavery of mankind, which prevails more or less in all nations, notwithstanding the best laws that can be made to prevent it. Nay, but 'tis owing to the badness of the constitution; insomuch that we must despair of seeing any good Discipline, as long as these Ecclesiastical Courts are continued.

But no rational man will conclude from thence, that these are sufficient reasons for men to tear the Church to pieces, and quarrel with one another, as if they would mingle heaven and earth together. What the commonwealth is without putting the laws in execution, the same is the Church without Discipline; and *no rational man* will set any great value upon such a Church. Nor are they to be accused of Schism, or *tearing*

* *Pag.* 350. † *Lib.* vii. *c.* 25.

tearing the Church in pieces, who in this case separate, but they who utterly ruin all Discipline. Let us hear the furious Author of *The Case of the Regale and the Pontificate*, who thus severely reflects upon his Brethren: "But if they would "trust to Christ, and have faith in his promises, and not "fear to execute the commission he has given to them, in "all sobriety and modesty, yet with courage and constan-"cy, for the good of the souls of men, and without do-"ing of which, they know, they confess, that they can-"not discharge that great trust as they ought to do, nor be "true to their master, nor to the souls committed to their "charge, many of whom they see run headlong every day "to all destruction and perdition, for want of that Disci-"pline which they dare not execute, only content them-"selves to wish every *Ashwednesday*, that it were restor'd; "send one poor longing wish after it once a year, but "move neither hand nor foot towards it, &c.* Who then will find fault with our people for taking more care of their souls? What rational man will blame our concern to preserve Discipline? And since the restoration thereof by the friends of the Hierarchy seems a thing to be utterly despair'd of, it would be the prudentest part for all those, whether Ministers or people, who earnestly long for it, to come over to our side.

The CONCLUSION.

OUR Author here, in the Conclusion of his work, lets us know his own opinion of it; and what he imagin'd many others, not only among the Dissenters, but the Churchmen, would judge of it. *I suppose*, says he, *by this time I have said enough in defence of our Church, tho' far short of what it deserves. Yet I am afraid I have not satisfy'd many, both of our own, and the contrary part, who are too much under the influence of prejudice.*† Whether he has *said enough in defence of* his *Church*, or *less than it deserves*, is refer'd to the judgment of all men of candour, who shall peruse this our Answer. What the judgment of his own side will prove concerning it, is not my business to inquire. But 'tis worth while to take

* Pref. *p.* 19. † *Pag.* 351.

take notice of the reason he gives, why he thought we should not much approve his performance. *I expect*, says he, *war from the heated Nonconformists, because I have expos'd the wild freaks of their predecessors, and taken off the foul reproaches which they have cast upon our Church.* There is no great reason to wonder, if, in the management of this controversy, hard words have been dropt on both sides. I could easily produce, from the writings of the Episcopal side, much more severe expressions, than what have been used by any of our Authors. But to what purpose should I do it? We desire to dispute about the things themselves, and not about mens characters. Hence I have generally pass'd by whatever our Author has cited in his margin from our writers; not because I was asham'd of them, for I have defended the greatest part of their assertions, tho' without taking notice of their words; but because it seem'd to me to signify little in the controversy. But I desire our Brethren would guess from Dr. *Nichols*, what kind of writings those are, which the High Church have publish'd against us. How is his own book fill'd with calumnies and reproaches, levell'd not only against us, but against our Brethren abroad, whom he has chosen Judges in our controversy? What then may be expected from those, whose censure the Doctor expects upon the account of his moderation and gentleness? he has indeed set out their temper to the life in what he says next: *And I foresee at the same time, that I shall be attack'd in my quarters by some of my own Brethren, because I have not been severe enough upon the books and sermons of the present Nonconformists, but, like a cowardly champion, have trampled upon the ashes of the dead. They will be ready to say, I should have muster'd up all the invidious or unwary sayings of the present Dissenters, with all the aggravations imaginable, in order to turn the indignation of the Queen and Parliament upon them. Nor shall I easily be forgiven by some, for allowing that there are honest men among Nonconformists, and true lovers of piety; that many of their Preachers are men of great learning; that I applaud and extol some of their sermons; that if there be no other way for their admittance into the Church, rather than lose their joint labours with ours in the vineyard of Christ, I would willingly consent, that some indifferent things, tho' venerable for their great antiquity, should be either laid aside, or left to the choice of the Minister, whether he will use them or not.* You see now, Reverend Brethren, the worthy Arbitrators and Judges of our controversy, what spirits we have to deal with. For thus we

find

find the far greater part of the Clergy (the more is the pity) are affected toward us. That Dr. *Nichols* is pleas'd to ſpeak ſo honorably of our preſent ſet of Miniſters, we eſteem a favour; but we take it ill he ſhould load the memory of our predeceſſors with ſo many reproaches. We have always an high eſteem and veneration for their piety, moderation, and learning. Them we imitate, their example we follow, tho' we are far from coming up to it. That he profeſſes an inclination to peace, is likewiſe moſt pleaſing to us; for we are all very deſirous of peace; nor is any thing ſo dear to us, that we will not be willing to ſacrifice it, provided it be with a ſafe conſcience, for the ſake of ſo valuable a bleſſing. But I wiſh a perſon, who pretends to be ſuch a friend to peace, had not ſo widely miſs'd his aim. He has offer'd no new terms to procure that agreement, which he declares himſelf earneſtly to long for. I wiſh the pains he has taken to miſrepreſent the Nonconformiſts, and to expoſe them to the contempt of our Brethren abroad, had been rather employ'd in perſuading the government ſeriouſly to think of ſome way to heal our breaches; and in adviſing his own Brethren to come at length to a temper, and to be deſirous of an accommodation. As things go now, we think it very happy, that the learned Mr. *Calderwood*'s *Altare Damaſcenum* has been lately reprinted abroad, at the inſtigation of ſome of our Brethren there, who have greatly oblig'd us by that favour. That one writer, whom, as King *James* foreſaw, no man has yet ventur'd to anſwer, is abundantly ſufficient to confute all the arguments of our Adverſaries. Wherefore ſince that book, which was formerly very ſcarce, is now in every bodies hands, our Brethren may from thence more fully inform themſelves concerning our cauſe; altho' I would hope, that neither this ſmaller work of mine, wherein I have uſed ſuch a ſtile as I was able, but arguments which, unleſs I am miſtaken, want not for ſtrength, will prove wholly uſeleſs, either to overthrow the reaſons, or confute the calumnies, wherewith Dr. *Nichols* has lately attack'd us.

All that remains, is, that you, our worthy Judges, would now determine between us. As for our part, we do not decline the having our cauſe heard before any impartial judges, and conſequently before you. For tho' by our Adverſaries we are deſpis'd, and loaded with abundance of calumnies and reproaches; yet we make no doubt, that you will have the great and aweful judgment before your eyes,

and

and judge without respect of persons, even as you shall also then be judg'd; and will never condemn those Churches, which endeavour to serve God with pure and safe consciences, according to the direction of his Word. Nay, my Brethren, you ought diligently to lay hold of this opportunity the Episcoparians have given you. Which of you does not bewail the corrupt state of the Church here in our country? They have now chosen you Arbitrators, and we readily join issue with them. I wish they may at length hearken to you, who have always been deaf both to our intreaties and arguments. Nor ought you to decline to undertake this office, who well understand how great the blessedness of peacemakers is.

And now my prayer is to thee, most merciful Father: Do thou regard this my weak endeavour, and direct it to the profit of thy Church; consider her most afflicted state, by reason of external enemies, and internal discords; and pour out at length thy Spirit, who alone is the most rich and plentiful fountain of all truth, purity, peace and concord. Thee, who only canst do it, even thee I earnestly intreat, to calm the passions of our Adversaries, and turn their hearts to the love of peace; that so we may, as one, worship thee our one common Father, thro' thy Son the one Mediator, by the help of one Holy Spirit, and *endeavour to keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace.*

FINIS.

Publish'd by the same Author.

I. REmarks on Dr. *Wells*'s Letters, &c. Wherein the *Doctor*'s Writings against the Dissenters are fully consider'd: In Eight Letters. 8*vo*.

II. Some Considerations on the sixth Chapter of the Abridgment of the *London* Cases, containing a Vindication of the Office for Baptism, and particularly of the Sign of the Cross. 8*vo*.

III. An Useful Ministry a Valid one: Being a Sermon preach'd at *Exon*, *May* 5. 1714. at a Meeting of the United Ministers of *Devon* and *Cornwal*. The Fourth Edition. 8*vo*. Price *6 d*.

IV. Presbyterian Ordination prov'd regular: A Sermon preach'd at an Ordination. The Second Edition. 8*vo*. Price *6 d*.

V. A Letter to Dr. *Bennet*, occasion'd by his late Treatise concerning the *Nonjurors* Separation. The Second Edition. 8*vo*. Price *6 d*.

VI. The *Curse* causeless: A Sermon preach'd at *Exon*, *Jan*. 30. 1717. The Fifth Edition. 8*vo*. Price 4 *d*.

VII. A Defence of the Dissenting Ministry, and Presbyterian Ordination; being an Answer to two Pamphlets: The one intituled, *The Invalidity of the Dissenting Ministry*; the other, *The Rational and Moral Conduct of Mr.* Peirce, *examin'd*, &c. Part I. 8*vo*. Price 1 *s*.

VIII. A Defence of the Dissenting Ministry, and Presbyterian Ordination. Part II. Being an Answer to the two last Chapters of the Pamphlet, intituled, *The Rational and Moral Conduct of Mr.* Peirce, *examin'd*, &c. 8*vo*. Price 1 *s*. *6 d*.

IX. The Dissenters Reasons for not Writing in the Behalf of Persecution; design'd for the Satisfaction of Dr. *Snape*, in a Letter to him. The Third Edition. 8*vo*. Price *6 d*.

X. Some Reflections on Dr. *Sherlock*'s *Vindication of the Corporation and Test Acts*. 8*vo*. The Second Edition. Price *6 d*.

Sold by JOHN CLARK.